THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS:

OR,

The *MASS* dead and buried, without hope of Resurrection.

L. C: T. Barlow. VII. Oct.

Translated out of *French*.

LONDON,
Printed by *Andrew Clark*, and are to be sold by *Randal Taylor* at the sign of the *Crown* in *Little Britain*. 1673.

BIBLIOTHECA·BODLEIANA·

To the Right Honourable

The Earl of

SHAFTESBURY,

Lord High Chancellour

OF

ENGLAND, &c.

My Lord,

I Could not without injustice, have dedicated this Book to any but your Lordship, because, as there is no person to whom I am so much obliged, so there is no member of either House of

Parliament that hath ſo freely and generouſly owned the Proteſtant intereſt. As for my obligations to your Lordſhip, becauſe they are too great to be expreſt, it is my duty to take all occaſions of expreſſing my thankfulneſs for them, and therefore I take this occaſion to proclaim my thankfulneſs to the World. As for your Lordſhips late owning the Proteſtant intereſt in the Houſe of Peers, it was ſo eminent, and accompanied with ſuch zeal and courage, that (next under God, and the King) your Lordſhip may deſervedly be ſtiled the chief aſſerter and promoter of it, and conſequently the aſſerter and promoter of the intereſt of *England*. For the intereſt of the Proteſtant Religion,

and the intereſt of this Kingdom, are ſo interwoven, that the welfare or ruine of either, is the welfare or ruine of both. Now being obliged by your Lordſhip, both as an *Engliſh* Proteſtant, and alſo more particularly in my private capacity, I beſeech God to grant that your life may be long and proſperous, your memory and poſterity honourable, as long as the Sun and Moon ſhall endure, and your ſoul and body eternally happy, when time ſhall be no more. To this Prayer I ſhall only add, that I am unfeignedly,

My Lord,

Your Lordſhips

Moſt affectionate honourer,

and moſt humble Servant,

S. A.

and the Interest of this Kingdom are so interwoven, that the welfare or ruine of either, is the welfare or ruine of both. Now being obliged by your Lordship, both as an English Protestant, and also more particularly in my private capacity, I beseech God to grant that your Honour may be long and prosperous, your memory and posterity honourable, as long as the Sun and Moon shall endure, and your Soul and Body eternally happy, when time shall be no more. To this Prayer I shall only add, that I am unfeignedly

My Lord

Your Lordships

The PREFACE.

THE Author of this Piece was one *Mounſieur de Rodon*, Philoſophy Profeſſor in the Royal Colledge at *Niſmes*, a City of *Languedoc* in *France*, where it was written. But as ſoon as it was Printed, it was ſuppreſt by the command of Authority, prohibiting all perſons to keep any of them, upon I know not what ſevere penalties, and ſuch Copies as could be found, were publickly burnt by the Hangman, about 1660. Whereupon the poor Gentleman, for fear of being condemned to keep company with his Books, was forced to fly to *Geneva*, where he not long after died. Theſe ſeverities of our Adverſaries bring to my remembrance what a learned and ingenious *Frenchman* once told me, *viz.* that this ſmall

ſmall Tract hath more netled their Party then any one Piece that ever was extant in *France* ſince the Reformation of Religion there. Whether that be a miſtake, I know not, but this I dare affirm, that though many famous men of that Kingdom have, in the memory of this Age, written very ſmartly againſt the *Romiſh* hereſies, yet there is not one of them whoſe perſon and writings have had ſuch hard meaſure. Whence it appears that our Author (his very enemies being judges) hath made good what he undertook, *viz.* he hath deſtroyed that great *Diana* the Maſs, and hath alſo, by way of prevention, deſtroyed all the Arguments made uſe of by the *Romiſh* Doctors for the reſtoring and re-eſtabliſhing of her; which he hath ſo well performed, that to this very day, not one of them hath dared ſo much as to attempt to revive her, by anſwering his Book; ſo that here you may ſee her laid in her grave, without hope of reſurrection; and there-

therefore the Book may very fitly be termed, *The Funeral of the Mass*; and consequently the Funeral of *Romish* heresies and idolatries, as the Author well observes. For the truth is the Mass and the *Romish* Religion are almost convertible terms, so that if the former be destroyed, the latter must vanish into its first nothing, and therefore our Author having destroyed the Mass, hath destroyed the thing called Popery too. As for the monstrous absurdities and blasphemies which flow from this one *Romish* doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, they would fill whole volumes; but I shall content my self to say that the Mass consists of more gross and abominable Superstitions, Phanaticisms, and Idolatries, then ever have been believed or practised by the most ignorant Pagans. What the tenets of the *Romanists* are, and what their practices have been in reference to Protestant Magistrates and People, woful and sad experience hath

suffi-

ſufficiently taught the World. I ſhall only add, that they are as pernicious to our bodies, and eſtates as their heretical Doctrines, and idolatrous Services are to our Souls. And conſequently to introduce Popery into this Kingdome would be an act as unpolitick as Anti-chriſtian, as hath been demonſtrated in that incomparable piece, entituled, *The eſtabliſhed Religion in oppoſition to Popery.* But becauſe (I know not by what ſtrange infatuation or enchantment, or rather by what wonderful judgment of God) this monſtrous, abſurd, and deſtructive (ſhall I call it?) Religion prevails amongſt us, I thought good to Engliſh and Print this ſmall Treatiſe, as the beſt Antidote againſt Popery (the Holy Scripture excepted) that ever I read; and for ought I know, it is not inferior to the beſt of this kind, that ever was yet extant: to which opinion the harſh uſage it hath had from our Adverſaries, as aforeſaid, doth certainly give no ſmall

Teſti-

Teſtimony. But I know that the holy Scripture it ſelf cannot profit except God be pleaſed to give his bleſſing, much leſs can this Book; and therefore, I earneſtly beſeech him that he would make it proſperous and ſucceſsful for the good of Souls; and if any ſhall receive benefit by it, I deſire them to give him all the glory, and then I ſhall think my ſelf infinitely recompenſed for my pains in tranſlating it.

The

The Contents of the Chapters.

Chap. I.

1. *Concerning the Expoſition of theſe words*, This is my Body. Page 1.

Chap. II.

2. *Concerning the Expoſition of theſe words*, He that eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my bloud hath eternal life. My fleſh is meat indeed, &c. P.10.

Chap. III.

3. *Againſt Tranſubſtantiation.* P.19.

Chap. IV.

4. *Againſt the real preſence of Chriſts Body in the Hoſt or conſecrated Wafer.* P.32.

Chap. V.

5. *Againſt the adoration or worſhiping of the Hoſt.* P.56.

Chap. VI.

6. *Againſt the taking away of the cup.* P.78.

Chap. VII.

7. *Againſt the Maſs.* P.91.

Chap. VIII.

8. *Containing anſwers to the objections of the* Romiſh *Doctors.* P.112.

The

Amend the following Errours of the Press thus:

PAg. 2. *line* 5. *for* obſcure *read* obſcurely. *p.* 23. *l.* 7. *for* then *read* elſe; *p.* 46. *l.* 22. *for* accident *read* accidents. *p.* 49. *l.* 21. *for* being *read* ſeing. *p.* 51. *l.* 3. *for* that ſhould *read* that it ſhould. *p.* 57. *l.* 17. *for* creatures *read* creature. *p.* 60. *l.* 13. *for* tood *read* too *p.* 66. *l.* 17. *for* Apoſtles *read* Apoſtle. *p.* 83. *l.* 11. *read* Paſtors only, becauſe. *p.* 105. *l.* 2. *read* Council of *Trent*. *p.* 108. *l.* 4. *for* Maſs *read* Croſs. *p.* 115. *l.* 17. *for* that by *read* that is by. *p.* 124. *l.* 18. *for* Apoſtle *read* Apoſtles. *p.* 130. *l.* 23. *read* Prieſt.) *p.* 133. *l.* 13. *dele* them.

THE FUNERAL OF THE MASS.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Expoſition of theſe words, *This is my Body.*

THE Romaniſts are wont to tell us, that theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *This is my Body*, are ſo clear to prove the Real Preſence of Chriſts Body in the Hoſt, and conſequently to prove Tranſubſtantiation (or the ſubſtantial converſion of the Bread into Chriſts Body) that they are amazed we cannot perceive ſo mani-

ſeſt a truth. Againſt which I form this Argument: He that ſpeaks contrary to the uſage of all the World, and takes words otherwiſe then all other men do, muſt without doubt, ſpeak very obſcure: But if Jeſus Chriſt by theſe words, *This is my Body*, had meant the real preſence of his Body in the Hoſt (as the Romiſh Doctors aſſert) and conſequently had meant the ſubſtantial converſion of the Bread into his Body, he had ſpoken contrary to the common uſage of all the World, and had taken the words otherwiſe then all other men do, which I thus prove. There was never any Author either ſacred, or prophane, that made uſe of ſuch words as theſe, *This is my Body*, to ſignifie the ſubſtantial converſion of one thing into another; or to ſignifie the real preſence of a thing immediately after the pronouncing of them, and not before. On the contrary, there was never any man that did not uſe them to ſignifie, that the thing was already that which it was ſaid to be. For example; When God the Father, ſpeaking of Jeſus Chriſt, ſaid, *This is my beloved Son* it is certain that Jeſus Chriſt was the Son of God before God ſaid it: and in common uſage it is never ſaid this is that, except the thing be ſo before it is ſaid to be ſo. For example; We do not ſay *this is a Table*, before that, which we mean by the word *this*,

this, be a Table. Therefore it is contrary to the common stile of all Authors, as well sacred as prophane, and contrary to the common usage of all men, to make these words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, to signifie the substantial conversion of the Bread into Christs Body, and the real presence of his Body in the Host immediately after the pronouncing of them by the Priest, and not before. Seeing then that Jesus Christ, when he said, *This is my Body*, did not speak contrary to the common usage of all the World, and did not take the words otherwise then all other men do, it necessarily follows that these words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, do not signifie the substantial conversion of the Bread into Christs Body, nor the real presence of Christs Body in the Host immediately after the Priest hath pronounced them, and not before. And this being so, the Romish Doctors must seek some other passages of Scripture, than this, *This is my Body*, to prove such a conversion, and such a presence; and seeing they can find none, I conclude that such a conversion and such a presence, have no foundation in holy Scripture.

2 That which I have said concerning common usage is founded on this reason, *viz.* because things must be before there can be any Image, Picture, or Representation of them,

and conſequently Images are after the things whereof they are Images: But words are the Images of conceptions, and conceptions the Images of things: Therefore things are ſuch before we can really conceive them to be ſuch, and we conceive them to be ſuch, before we can ſay they are ſuch. Therefore that which Jeſus Chriſt held, and gave to his Diſciples, expreſſed by the word *this*, was his body, before he conceived that it was his body, and he conceived that it was his body, before he ſaid *This is my Body*; and conſequently it is not by vertue of theſe words, *This is my Body*, that that which Jeſus Chriſt gave to his Diſciples, expreſſed by the word *this*, was his Body; but rather it is by bleſſing the bread, or thankſgiving that the bread was made the Body of Chriſt, becauſe it was made the Sacrament of it. Whence it follows that theſe words, *this is my body*, muſt be expounded thus, *this bread is my body*; and theſe words *this bread is my body*, muſt be expounded thus, *this bread is the Sacrament of my body*; which I prove thus.

3. A Propoſition muſt be expounded according to the nature of the thing in queſtion; for example, If a man, pointing at the Kings Perſon, ſhould ſay, *this is the King*, the Propoſition muſt be expounded thus, *this is the Kings Perſon*, becauſe the Kings Perſon is meant: But if a

man

man coming into a Painters Shop, and pointing at the Kings Picture, should say, *this is the King*, the Propolition must be expounded thus, *this is the Kings Picture*; because here his Picture is meant. Even so if Jesus Christ laying his hand on his Breast, had said this is my Body, we must without doubt have understood the Proposition concerning his real Body, and not concerning the Sign, or Sacrament of it; because his very Body had been then meant, and not the sign or Sacrament of it: But Jesus Christ, being about to institute the Eucharist, and to that end, having taken bread, blessed it, and given it to his Disciples with these words, *Take, eat, this is my Body*, it is evident that they must be understood of the Sacrament of his Body, and the Proposition must be expounded thus, *this is the Sacrament of my Body* because here the Sacrament of his Body is meant. And seeing a Sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, as the Council of Trent saith, in its sixth Session, it is evident that this Propolition, *This is my Body*, being expounded by this, *this is the Sacrament of my Body*, may be expounded thus, *this is the sign of my Body*; which I confirm thus.

4 In these two Propositions, *This is my body, This cup is the New Testament in my bloud*, the word [*is*] must be taken in the same sense, be-

cause they are alike, having been pronounced upon the same matter, *viz.* the one upon one part of the Sacrament, and the other upon the other part of it; and because of like things we must give a like judgment. But in this Proposition, *this cup is the New Testament*, the word [*is*] is not taken for a real and transubstantiated being; but for a sacramental and significative being: because neither the cup, nor that which is in the cup, is changed into a Testament; neither is it really and properly a Testament, but the Sacrament of the New Testament. Therefore in this Proposition likewise, *this is my body*, the word [*is*] is not taken for a real and transubstantiated being; but for a sacramental and significative being: and consequently as this Proposition, *this cup is the New Testament*, must be expounded thus; the Wine that is in the cup is the sign and Sacrament of the New Testament: So this Proposition, *this is my body*, must be expounded thus, this Bread is the sign and Sacrament of my Body. Whence it follows that in one single Proposition of Jesus Christ in the institution of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, *viz. this cup is the New Testament*, there are two figures, one in the word *Cup*, being taken for that which is in the cup; this is a figure called a *Metonymie*, whereby the thing containing is taken for the thing contained.

tained. The other Figure is, that the cup is called the New Testament: this is also a Figure called a *Metonymie*, whereby the sign is called by the name of the thing signified. And therefore the *Romish* Doctors are mistaken when they tell us that all that Jesus Christ said when he instituted the Eucharist, must be taken literally, and without a figure. But withal we must not imagine that Jesus Christ spake obscurely, because he spake figuratively, these figures and manners of speech, being commonly and familiarly used by all the World.

5. But when we say that these words, *this is my body, this is my bloud*, must be expounded thus, this Bread is the Sign and Sacrament of my Body, this Wine is the Sign and Sacrament of my Bloud, we do not mean that the Bread and Wine are barely and simply signs of Christs Body and Bloud; but we believe that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are signs that do exhibit the body and bloud of Christ to Believers: For when they do, by the mouth of the body receive the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist, they do at the same time, by the mouth of the soul, *viz.* by Faith, receive the Body of Christ broken, and his Bloud shed for the remission of their sins, as will be proved in the next Chapter.

6. Add hereunto this one Argument: When

a man saith that a thing is such, if it be not such, during the whole time, which he imploys in saying it is such, he makes a false Proposition. For example, When a man saith that a Wall is white, if it be not white, during the whole time he imploys in saying it is white, he makes a false Proposition. But (according to the *Romish* Doctors) when Jesus Christ said, *this is my body*, it was not his body during the whole time which he imployed in saying *this is my body*; for, they say, it was his body afterward only: Therefore, according to the *Romish* Doctors, Jesus Christ uttered a false Proposition: which being blasphemous to affirm, we must lay down this for a foundation, that that which Jesus Christ gave his Disciples when he said, *this is my body*, was his body, not only after he had said it, but also while he was saying it, and before he said it. And here we have this advantage of those of the *Romish* Church, that we believe the truth of these words of Jesus Christ, *this is my body*, much better then they do; because they believe it at one time only, *viz.* after he had said it: but we believe it at three several times, *viz.* before he said it, when he was saying it, and after he had said it. But here some may object that we must not take the words of our Lord in too rigorous a sense, and that in these words, *this is my body*, we must take

take the Present tense for the next Future, and then the sense will be this, this will immediately be my body. To which I answer, that the *Romish* Doctors will have us take these words, *this is my body*, in the rigour of the literal sense, and then the Proposition is evidently false. I know that the Present tense may be taken for the next Future, as when Jesus Christ said, *I go to my Father, and to your Father; I go to my God, and to your God:* that is, I shall go speedily. But who can be so bold and ignorant as to affirm that this speech is without a Figure, seeing all Grammarians know that it is a Figure called *Enallage* of time? Therefore the *Romish* Doctors must confess, that by their own doctrine this Proposition of Jesus Christ, *this is my body*, is either false or figurative; and that seeing it is not false, it must be figurative, and that the figure must be a *Metonymie*, whereby the sign takes the name of the thing signified (as hath already been proved) and not an Enallage of time.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the Exposition of these words,

He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my bloud hath eternal life. My flesh is meat indeed, &c.

1. IN this Chapter I shall prove that Jesus Christ speaks of a spiritual eating and drinking by Faith, and not of a corporal eating and drinking by the mouth of the body. My first Argument is this. When a man would satisfie his hunger, and quench his thirst, he eateth, and drinketh that thing, which he hungers and thirsts after; because eating satisfieth hunger, and drinking quencheth thirst: But it is by Faith, that is, by believing in Jesus Christ, that we satisfie the hunger, and quench the thirst which we have after Christ; for it is in the sixth of St. *John*, *He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst:* Therefore it is by Faith or by believing, that we eat and drink Jesus Christ; and consequently the eating of Christs flesh, and drinking his bloud is spiritual, and not corporal.

2. My second Argument is this: Jesus Christ saith,

saith, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood hath eternal life.* And *except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,* John 6. But it is the spiritual eating and drinking by Faith that gives life eternal, and not the corporal eating and drinking by the mouth of the body; because many Reprobates (according to the very doctrine of *Rome* it self) do corporally eat the flesh, and drink the bloud of Christ, and yet shall not inherit eternal life.

3. The third Argument is taken from S. *Augustine*, and Cardinal *Cajetan*, who expound the words of Jesus Christ as we do. St. *Augustin* in Book 3. of *Christian Doctrine*, speaketh thus, *To eat the flesh of Christ is a figure, teaching us to partake of Christs Passion, and to imprint in our memories with delight and profit, that Christ was crucified for us.* Card. *Cajetan* in his Commentary on St. *John* 6. saith, *To eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his bloud, is faith in Christs death; so that the sense is this, if you use not the death of the Son of man as meat and drink, ye shall not have the life of the Spirit in you.* And having sufficiently proved his Exposition, he adds: *To eat and drink the Sacrament is a thing common, as well to those that eat unworthily, as to those that eat worthily, but that which Jesus Christ here speaks of, is not common to both, for he saith, he that*

that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; he saith not he that eateth worthily and drinketh worthily, but he that eateth and drinketh. Whence it clearly appears, that according to the Letter, he speaks not of eating, and drinking the Sacrament of the Eucharist, but of eating and drinking the death of Jesus Christ.

4. Now that we may clearly understand this doctrine, we must consider, wherein the life which Jesus Christ gives us, doth consist; for seeing the flesh of Jesus Christ is meat to us, because it gives us life; it is evident that if we know what life that is which Jesus Christ gives us, we must know likewise how Jesus Christ is meat to us, and consequently how we eat him. But to know what that life is which Jesus Christ gives us, we must consider what that death is in which we were involved, which is expressed by St. *Paul*, *Ephes.* 2. in these words: *When we were dead in sins and trespasses God hath quickned us together with Christ: by grace ye are saved*; and consequently the death in which we were involved, consists in two things, first in the curse of the Law, which imports the privation of felicity, and the suffering of temporal and eternal punishment for our sins: Secondly it consists in an habitual corruption, whereby sin raigns in us; and therefore it is said 1 *Tim.* 5.

The

The widow that lives in pleasure is dead while she liveth. Also sins are called *dead works*, *Heb.* 10. So that the life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us, consists in two things. First, In deliverance from the curse of the Law by the pardon of our sins, as St. *Paul* tells us, *Colloss.* 2. *God hath quickned you together with Christ, having forgiven you all trespasses, blotting out the obligation that was against us*; which obligation proceeded from the Law, because it did oblige all the transgressors of it to a curse. Secondly, It consists in regeneration, or sanctification, whereof Jesus Christ speaking in *John* 3. saith, *Except a man be born again he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*: and S. *Paul Heb.* 12. *Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.* Therefore seeing that the life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us, consists in the pardon of our sins, and in our regeneration, and sanctification, which ends in glorification; and that Jesus Christ is called meat in reference to this life, we must consider the means, whereby Jesus Christ hath purchased these things for us; and seeing it is certain, that his death is the means by which he hath purchased pardon of sins, and regeneration, we must conclude that Jesus Christ is the food and nourishment of our souls in regard of the merit of his death. But that Jesus Christ by his death hath purchased life for

us, (that is justification, which consists in the pardon of our sins, and regeneration, which consists in holiness of life) appears by these passages of Scripture *viz.* *We are justified by the blood of Christ, and reconciled to God by his death,* Rom. 5. *We have redemption by his blood, even the remission of sins.* Ephes. 1. *He hath reconciled us in the body of his flesh by his death, that he may present us holy, without spot, and blameless in his sight.* Coll. 1. *We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.* Heb. 10. *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctifie and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it unto himself a glorious Church, &c.* Eph. 5. Therefore seeing Jesus Christ hath purchased life for us by his death, and that his flesh and blood are our meat and drink (because they purchased life eternal for us on the Cross, *viz.* the remission of our sins, and sanctification, ending in glorification) it follows that the action whereby Jesus Christ is applied to us for righteousness and sanctification, is the same by which we eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood. But this action is nothing else but Faith, as the Scripture tells us: *Being justified by faith we have peace with God.* Rom. 5. *God purifies our hearts by faith.* Act. 15. *He that believeth hath eternal life.* Joh. 6. From what hath been said I form

form this Argument. That Action whereby we obtain remission of sins, and sanctification, ending in glorification, is the same, whereby we have that life, which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his death; because that life principally consists in the remission of sins, and sanctification, as we have proved. But the spiritual eating, and drinking by faith, and not the corporal by the mouth, is that action, whereby we obtain remission of sins, and sanctification, as we have also proved. Therefore the spiritual eating and drinking by faith is the action, whereby we have that life, which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his death, and not the corporal eating and drinking by the mouth. And consequently seeing in St. *John* 6. a certain eating and drinking is spoken of, whereby we have that life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his death; it is evident that a spiritual eating and drinking is there spoken of, and not a corporal.

5. From what hath been said it appears, that when Jesus Christ saith, *my flesh is meat indeed*, &c. the figure falls upon the word *meat*, which is taken not for corporal but spiritual meat. The reason whereof is, that corporal food is that which is appointed for the nourishment of the body, as spiritual food is that which is appointed for the nourishment

ment of the ſoul; ſo that although corporal food be taken by the mouth of the body, yet that only doth not make it to be corporal food, except it be taken for the nouriſhment of the body; otherwiſe poiſon, medicine, a bullet, &c. which a man ſhould ſwallow would be corporal food; which is abſurd to affirm. But the fleſh of Chriſt, which is pretended to be eaten in the Euchariſt by the mouth of the body, is not appointed for the nouriſhment of the body; becauſe that food which is appointed for the nouriſhment of the body is changed into the ſubſtance of the body: but the body of Chriſt is not changed into the ſubſtance of our bodies: Therefore the fleſh of Chriſt is not a corporal food, but his fleſh broken, and his bloud ſhed on the croſs is a ſpiritual food, which nouriſheth the ſouls of thoſe, who by a true and lively faith, do embrace this fleſh broken, and this bloud ſhed; that is, who do wholy reſt and rely on the merit of his death and paſſion for obtaining mercy from God. And certainly, ſeeing that the life which Jeſus Chriſt gives us by his death, is ſpiritual, that the nouriſhment is ſpiritual, that the eating his body and drinking his bloud, is ſpiritual (as hath been proved) it follows that his fleſh muſt be ſpiritual meat, and his bloud ſpiritual drink. And this fleſh of Chriſt is incomparably better, and more truly

meat

meat indeed in regard of its effects, than corporal food can be; because it doth better, and more perfectly nourish the souls of Believers then corporal food doth their bodies; this being corruptible food which gives temporal life only; but that spiritual and incorruptible food which gives life eternal.

6. I conclude this Chapter with this consideration. When a doctrine is proposed which is pretended to be divine, and that passages of holy Scripture are alledged for the proof of it, if it oppoſeth, or seems to oppose sense and reason, and to include contradictions; and that a more suitable and rational sense can be found out for those passages, so that all these inconveniences and contradictions may be avoided; there is nothing more just than that we should embrace that probable and rational sense, and reject that doctrine which oppoſeth sense and reason and seems to imply contradictions: But the doctrine of the real presence of the Manhood of Jesus Christ in the Host, and the transubstantiation of the Bread into his Body, is repugnant to sense and reason, and seems to include divers contradictions; (*viz.* that a humane body is in a point without any local extension, that a body may be in divers places at one and the same time, that the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood

of Christ, which were before; that accidents may be without a subject, &c.) And the passages that are impertinently alledged to prove such a presence, and such a change, have a sense very commodious and rational, for the avoiding all these contradictions, as appears in this and the former Chapter, where I have very rationally expounded those two passages which the *Romish* Doctors impertinently make use of for this subject. Therefore they ought to embrace that commodious and rational sense which we have given them; and to reject the doctrine of the real presence of the body of Jesus Christ in the Host, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Against Transubstantiation.

1. TRansubstantiation is the substantial conversion of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Bloud of Christ, which I destroy by divers Arguments; the first whereof is this:

In every substantial conversion, that thing into which another thing is converted, is always newly produced. For example, when seed is converted into an animal, that animal is newly produced; when Jesus Christ turned the water into wine, the wine was newly produced, *&c.* But the Body and Bloud of Christ cannot be newly produced in the Sacrament of the Eucharist: Therefore the Bread and Wine are not substantially converted into the Body and Bloud of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. The second Proposition, *viz.* that the Body and Bloud of Christ cannot be newly produced, I prove thus: That which is newly produced receives a new being; because to produce a thing, and to give it a being is one and the same: But the Body and Bloud of Christ cannot receive a new being, which I prove thus: A man can-

not receive that which he hath, while he hath it, and therefore he cannot receive a being while he hath a being; for as it is impoſſible to take away a being from that which hath no being; ſo it is impoſſible to give a being to that which hath a being already: and as you cannot kill a dead man, ſo you cannot give life to one that is living. But the Body and Bloud of Chriſt have, and always will have a being: Therefore they cannot receive one, and conſequently cannot be reproduced in the Euchariſt.

2. My ſecond Argument is this. In every ſubſtantial converſion, that thing which is converted into another is deſtroyed. For example, When the water was turned into wine, the water was deſtroyed: But in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt the Bread and Wine are not deſtroyed by the conſecration, which I prove thus: In the celebration of the Euchariſt there is breaking, giving, eating and drinking after the conſecration, as appears by the very practice of our Adverſaries, who after conſecration, break the Hoſt, and divide it into three parts, give nothing to the Communicants but conſecrated Hoſts, and eat and drink nothing but what was conſecrated: But the Scripture ſaith, that in the celebration of the Euchariſt, Bread is broken, that Bread and Wine are given, and that Bread is eaten and Wine drunk, as appears by

theſe

theſe following paſſages. St. *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 10. ſaith, *The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt?* and 1 *Cor.* 11. St. *Matth.* 26. St. *Mark* 14. and St. *Luke* 22. it is ſaid that *Jeſus Chriſt took bread, brake it and gave it*; and St. *Mark* 14. and St. *Matth.* 26. Jeſus Chriſt after he had participated of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, ſaith, *I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine*: and 1 *Cor.* 11. *As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup. Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.*

3. Secondly, When Jeſus Chriſt ſaid to his Diſciples, *Drink ye all of this*, St. *Matth.* 26. that is, drink ye all of this cup, either he commanded to drink of a cup of Wine, or of a cup of Bloud: if he commanded them to drink of a cup of Wine, then it follows that they drank nothing but Wine, becauſe it is certain that they obeyed Jeſus Chriſt; for it is ſaid St. *Mark* 14. that *they all drank of it*. Or if he commanded them to drink of a cup of Bloud, then it follows that the Wine was already changed into his Bloud, becauſe it is not probable that Jeſus Chriſt ſaid to them, Drink ye all of this cup of Bloud, and yet that it was not a cup of Bloud, but a cup of Wine. But when Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, *Drink ye all of this*, he did not ſpeak to them of a cup of Bloud for the Wine was

not then converted into Christs Bloud, because (according to our Adversaries) it was not changed until Jesus Christ had made an end of uttering these following words, *for this is my blood.* But he uttered these words, *Drink ye all of this*, before he uttered those, *for this is my blood*; because a man must utter a Proposition before he can give the reason of it.

4. Thirdly, When a thing is converted into another, we cannot see the effects and properties of the thing converted, but only of that into which it is converted. For example, When the seed is changed into an animal, we can see no more the effects and properties of the seed, but of the animal only; and when Jesus Christ turned the Water into Wine, the effects, properties, and accidents of the Water were no more seen, but of the Wine only, *&c.* But in the Eucharist we cannot, after the consecration, perceive the effects, properties, accidents, or parts of the Body and Bloud of Christ; but we see there all the effects, properties, and accidents of Bread and Wine: Therefore in the Eucharist, the Bread and Wine are not converted into the Body and Bloud of Christ. And the truth is, if that which appears to be Bread, and hath all the effects, accidents, and properties of Bread, be not Bread, but Christs Body cloathed with the accidents of Bread; then it may

like-

likewise be said that they that appear to be men, and have all the effects, properties, and accidents of men are not men, but horses cloathed with the accidents of men.

5. The fourth Argument is this. In every substantial conversion there must be a subject to pass from one substance to another; for then it would be a Creation, which is the sole action that doth not presuppose a subject. But in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration, there is no subject; because, according to our Adversaries, there remains no subject; for, as they assert, the accidents of Bread and Wine remain without any subject at all: Therefore in the Sacrament of the Eucharist there is no substantial conversion.

6. The fifth Argument is drawn from hence, That Transubstantiation destroys the nature of accidents, thus. That doctrine which asserts that accidents are not accidents but substances, destroys the nature and essence of accidents, because it is impossible that an accident can be a substance. But the doctrine of Transubstantiation asserts that accidents are not accidents, but that they are substances, which I prove thus. That doctrine which asserts that accidents are not inherent, but that they subsist of themselves, doth assert that accidents are not accidents, but that they are substan-

ces, because inherence is the essential difference of an accident, and subsistence the essential difference of a substance. But the doctrine of Transubstantiation asserts that accidents are not inherent, but that they subsist, which I prove thus. That doctrine which asserts that accidents may be without a subject, doth assert that accidents are not inherent in a subject, but that they subsist by themselves: But the doctrine of Transubstantiation asserts that accidents may be without a subject, *viz.* the accidents of Bread and Wine without any substance, and without any subject to sustain them; for by Transubstantiation the substance of the Bread and Wine is gone, and their accidents remain: Therefore the doctrine of Transubstantiation asserts that accidents are not inherent, but do subsist by themselves, and consequently asserts that accidents are not accidents, but substances, and so destroys the nature and essence of accidents. But here it may be said that actual inherence doth not constitute an accident, but aptitudinal only. Against which I form this Argument. Whatsoever doth exist actually, either it exists in something else actually so, that it cannot be without it, which Philosophers call actual inherence, as walking: or else it exists in and by it self actually, so that it may be alone by it self, which Philo-

Philosophers term *actual existence*; the former of these constitutes an accident, and the latter constitutes a substance. But the accidents of the Bread and Wine, after consecration, do exist actually: Therefore they must exist either in something else actually, or in themselves actually. But they do not exist in and by themselves actually, for then they would subsist by themselves, and be real substances, which is impossible: Therefore they exist in something else actually, *viz.* in the substance of the Bread and Wine, and consequently the substance of the Bread and Wine remains after the Consecration, and so there can be no Transubstantiation.

7. The sixth Argument is drawn from this, That Transubstantiation destroys the nature of Sacraments, because every Sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, as the Council of *Trent* saith in *Sess.* 6. and every sign relates to the thing signified, so that we must speak of signs and Sacraments, as of things relating to something else. But all relative things have, as it were, a double being, *viz.* an absolute being which is the natural being of the thing, and a relative being whereby it relates to something else. For example, In a man that hath begotten a child, we consider his absolute and natural being as he is a man as others are, and his

his relative being, whereby he is a Father, and is distinguished from other men that have no children, and so are not Fathers. So in the Sacrament of Baptism, the sign, *viz.* the Water, hath an absolute and natural being, *viz.* its cold and moist substance, whereby it is water as other waters are; and a relative, sacramental, and significative being, whereby it is the sign and Sacrament of Christs Bloud, and differs from other waters that are not imployed for this sacred use. Even so in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the Bread and Wine, which are the signs, have their natural and absolute being, *viz.* their substance whereby they are Bread and Wine, as other Bread and Wine, which we commonly use; and their relative, sacramental, and significative being, whereby they are the Sacrament and signs of the Body and Bloud of Christ, and differ from all other Bread and Wine that is not thus imployed. To this I add, That it is impossible a relative being should be without an absolute, because a relative cannot be without its foundation. For example; It is impossible to be a Father without being a Man; to be equal without quantity, *&c.* And this being granted, I form my Argument thus, That which takes away the natural being from signs and Sacraments, destroys their nature and essence;

because

because the relative and sacramental being cannot be without the absolute and natural, as hath been proved. But the doctrine of Transubstantiation destroys the natural being of the Bread and Wine, which are signs and Sacraments of Christs Body and Bloud; for by transubstantiation, the whole substance of the Bread and Wine is destroyed: Therefore the doctrine of Transubstantiation destroys the nature and essence of Sacraments.

8. To this Argument our Adversaries answer, That in the Eucharist the Bread and Wine are not signs, because by the consecration they are destroyed as to their substance. But some of them say that the signs are the accidents of the Bread and Wine; others say that the Body and Bloud of Christ contained under the accidents of the Bread and Wine, are the signs of the Body and Bloud of Jesus Christ crucified; Lastly, others say, that neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine only, nor the Body and Bloud of Christ only, but the Body and Bloud of Christ, together with the accidents of the Bread and Wine, are the signs of the Body and Bloud of Jesus Christ crucified: Therefore seeing the doctrine of Transubstantiation doth not destroy the natural being of Christs Body and Bloud, nor the natural being of the accidents of the Bread and Wine, they maintain that

that the doctrine of Transubstantiation doth not destroy the nature and essence of Sacraments.

9. To this I reply, That neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine only, nor the Body and Bloud of Christ only, nor the Body and Bloud of Christ together with the accidents of the Bread and Wine, are the true signs of Jesus Christ crucified; but the Bread and Wine only, which I prove thus:

First, In Sacraments there ought to be an analogy and similitude between the sign, and the thing signified, as our Adversaries confess, and particularly Card. *Bellarmin* Book 1. of the *Sacrament, chap. 9.* in these words. *The fourth thing required in a Sacrament, is that the sign should have some similitude and analogy with the thing signified.* And he quotes St. *Augustine* in *Epist.* 23. to *Boniface*, speaking thus: *If Sacraments had not some similitude of the things whereof they are Sacraments they could be no Sacraments:* But in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine, nor the Body and Bloud of Christ, whether jointly or severally, have that similitude and analogy to the thing signified which is required, but only the Bread and Wine in substance; because that which is principally signified, and represented by the signs in the Sacra-

ment

ment of the Euchariſt, is the nouriſhment of our ſouls in the hope of eternal life: for as Baptiſm is the Sacrament of our Regeneration and ſpiritual birth; ſo the Euchariſt is the Sacrament of our ſpiritual nouriſhment, as Card. *Bellarmin* confeſſeth in *Book* 3. *of the Euchariſt*, *chap.* 9. and in *Book* 4. *chap.* 19. he ſaith *that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt was ordained to preſerve ſpiritual life*; which cannot be repreſented and ſignified, but by ſigns which can nouriſh our bodies; for the analogy and ſimilitude conſiſts in this, that as the ſigns have vertue to nouriſh our bodies for the preſervation of temporal life; ſo the things ſignified have a vertue to nouriſh our ſouls in the hope of eternal life. But neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine, nor the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, whether ſeverally, or jointly with the accidents, can nouriſh our bodies, (nouriſhment being eſſentially the converſion of aliment into the ſubſtance of a living body,) and it is certain that neither the accidents of Bread and Wine, nor the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, whether ſeparately, or jointly with them, can be converted into our ſubſtance, but only the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, and other aliments which we take: Therefore neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine, nor the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, whether ſepa-

rately

rately, or jointly with them, are the true signs; but the Bread and Wine only, which being the ordinary nourishment of our bodies, do represent to us the spiritual nourishment of our souls by the Body and Bloud of Christ, received by Faith.

10. Secondly, The Council of *Trent* in *Session* 13. commands that the Sacrament of the Eucharist shall be adored with *Latria*, which according to our Adversaries, is the sovereign worship due to God only. But the accidents of the Bread and Wine ought not to be adored, because they are creatures, and that God only must be adored: Therefore the accidents of the Bread and Wine are not the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

Thirdly, A Sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, as the Council of *Trent* defines it in *Sessions* 6. and 13. But in the *Eucharist* the Body and Bloud of Christ are not visible: Therefore, in the Eucharist the body and bloud of Christ, are not the signs.

Lastly, I say, that in every Sacrament the sign relates to the thing signified; and Relation is always between two different things; because nothing relates to it self, and consequently nothing can be both the sign and thing signified. But the Body and Bloud of Christ are the things signified: Therefore the Body and

Bloud

Bloud of Christ are not the signs. And it is to no purpose to say that Jesus Christ in the Mass is the sign and figure of himself on the Cross; for Jesus Christ whereſoever he is, is one and the same yesterday, to day, and for ever. And therefore Jesus Christ not being different from himself, cannot be relative to himself, nor the sign of himself.

Other reasons which are usually alledged against Transubstantiation will be more properly mentioned in the next Chapter.

CHAP

CHAP. IV.

Against the real presence of Christs Body in the Host, or consecrated Wafer.

1. THe *Romish* Doctors affirm, That immediately after the Priest in the celebration of the Mass, hath pronounced these words, *this is my body*, the body of Christ is really present in the Host, and that it is whole and entire in every part and point of the Host; which doctrine I destroy by these following Arguments, the first whreof is this.

2. If a thing be created in a place, either it must be produced there, or it must come, or be brought thither from some other place; for it is impossible to find out a third way of putting any thing in a place. And the *Romish* Doctors have hitherto been able to invent but one of these two ways of putting Christs Body in the Host, the *Jacobins* telling us that it is brought thither from some other place, and the *Jesuites* that it is produced there. But the body of Christ can neither come, nor be brought thither into the Host, nor can it be produced there: Therefore the body of Christ is not in the Host.

3. First, The body of Christ cannot come,

or

or be brought into the Host from any other place, because it can come from no place but Heaven, being no where but in Heaven. But Christs body neither comes, nor is brought from Heaven into the Host; which I prove thus: When a body comes, or is carried from one place to another, it must leave its first place. For example, if a man would go from *Paris* to *Rome*, he must leave *Paris*: But the body of Jesus Christ never leaves Heavens; for *the heavens must contain him until the time of the restitution of all things. Act.* 3. Therefore Christs body neither comes, nor is brought from Heaven into the Host. Besides, it is impossible that Christs body should come or be brought into the host without passing through the space that is between Heaven and Earth where the consecrated Hosts are; because a man cannot pass from one extream to another without passing through the space that is between them. But the space between Heaven and Earth is too vast to be passed through in a moment (for these Doctors will have it, that immediately after the pronouncing of these words, *this is my body*, the body of Christ is brought into the Host.) Moreover it must in a moment be in all the Heavens, and in all the Airs between the highest Heaven, and this Earth where the Hosts are, (because a man cannot pass through a place

without being there; and then it would have three sorts of existences at once, *viz.* one natural and glorious existence in Heaven, one sacramental existence in the Host, and one airy existence in the Air. But seeing all these things are absurd, we must conclude that Christs body neither comes, nor is brought into the Host.

2. Secondly, Christs body cannot be reproduced in the consecrated Host, because a thing that is produced already, cannot be produced again, without a preceding destruction; for as a dead man cannot be killed, nor that be annihilated, which is annihilated already; so neither can that be produced which is produced already, nor that receive a being which hath one already. This common conception of all men is founded upon this principle, That every action, whether it produceth or destroyeth a thing, must necessarily have two distinct terms, the one called in the Schools, *terminus à quo*, that is, the term from which the thing comes, and the other *terminus ad quem*, that is, the term to which it comes. But according to this principle, that cannot be annihilated which is so already, nor that receive a being which hath one already; because the term from which it should come, and the term to which it should come, would be one and the same thing; contrary to the Maxime already laid down, *viz.*

that

that the terms of action muſt neceſſarily be diſtinct, and that one of them muſt be the negation or privation of the other.

5. Here perhaps it may be objected, That by Tranſubſtantiation the ſubſtance of Chriſts body is not newly produced, but only a new preſence of him in the place where the ſubſtance of the bread was. But to this I anſwer, That in all ſubſtantial converſions and actions, a new ſubſtance muſt be produced, as in accidental, a new accident muſt be produced. But Tranſubſtantiation (according to the *Romiſh* Doctors) is a ſubſtantial converſion: Therefore by Tranſubſtantiation a new ſubſtance muſt be produced. And ſeeing that the new preſence of Chriſts body in the place where the ſubſtance of the bread was, is not a ſubſtance, but an accident of the *Catagorie* which the Philoſophers call *Ubi*, it is evident that by Tranſubſtantiation the preſence of Chriſts body only is not produced in the place where the ſubſtance of the bread was; and ſeeing that the ſubſtance of Chriſts body is not produced there (as hath been proved in the preceding number) we muſt conclude that there is no Tranſubſtantiation nor real preſence of Chriſts body in the Hoſt. This inſtance doth alſo deſtroy the adduction of Chriſts body into the Hoſt, which hath been already refuted in number 3.

6. My second Argument is this. In a true humane body such as Christs body is, there is something above, and something under, right and left, before and behind; for the head is above the neck, and the neck above the shoulders, the shoulders above the breast, the breast above the stomach, the stomach above the belly, the belly above the thighs, the thighs above the legs, &c. But all the World knows that in a point there is nothing above or under, right or left, before or behind: Therefore Christs body is not in a point, and consequently it is not in every point, or part of the Host. To this I add, that the quantity and greatness of Christs body is nothing else but its length, breadth, and thickness, which cannot be in a point. Lastly, The quantity of Christs body is nothing else but its extent, as we all know; and a body is extended when it hath its parts one without another; that is, they are not one within another, as all the *Jesuites* expound it. But the doctrine of the presence of Christs body in the Host, puts all its parts one within another, because it puts them all in a point: Therefore such a doctrine takes away its extent, and consequently its quantity.

7. My third Argument is this. To move and not to move at the same time, to be eaten and not to be eaten at the same time, to be in a point and not in a point at the same time, to

occupy

occupy a place and not to occupy it at the ſame time, are contradictory things. But if the body of Chriſt were in divers conſecrated Hoſts, it would move and not move at the ſame time. For example, When a Prieſt carries a conſecrated Hoſt to a ſick perſon, the body of Chriſt which is pretended to be in it, moves with the Hoſt; for it leaves the Altar, and goes with the Prieſt toward the ſick perſons houſe, and at the ſame time the body of Chriſt, which is pretended to be in the other Hoſts that remain on the Altar, moves not; and ſo the ſame body of Chriſt at the ſame time moves and moves not, which is a contradiction. Seeing then it is impoſſible that one and the ſame body at one and the ſame time ſhould move and not move, it is likewiſe impoſſible that Chriſts body ſhould be in divers Hoſts at the ſame time. In like manner, if Chriſts body were at the ſame time in Heaven, and in the Hoſt it would be eaten and not eaten at the ſame time; for it would be eaten in the Hoſt by the Prieſt, and at the ſame time, it would not be eaten in Heaven. Alſo it would be in a point and not in a point at the ſame time; for in the Hoſt it would be in a point, and in Heaven it would not be in a point at the ſame time: Therefore ſeeing it is impoſſible that one and the ſame body at one and the ſame time ſhould be eaten and not eaten, ſhould

be in a point and not in a point; it is also impossible that Christs body should be both in Heaven and in the Host at the same time.

8 The fourth Argument is this: Two relatives are always different, as the Father and Son, the Husband and the Wife, &c. and relation is always between two things that really differ; as the equality between two Ells, the resemblance between two Crows, &c. In a word, nothing can have relation to it self, but whatsoever hath relation must necessarily have it to something else, as appears by the definition of Relation: But to be distant is a relative and not an absolute term; for when we conceive an absolute term we conceive but one thing, as when we conceive a Crow; but when we conceive a relative term, we necessarily conceive two things. For example, We cannot conceive a Crow to be like, without conceiving something else to which it is like. Seeing then we cannot conceive a thing to be distant without conceiving something else from which it is distant, it is evident that to be distant is a relative term, and that distant things are relatives, and consequently are really different. Whence I form this Argument: Relative things are really different, as hath been proved: But the body that is at *Rome* is distant from that which is at *Paris*, by reason of the space of about 300 leagues

leagues that is between those two Cities; and the body that is in the highest heavens is distant from that which is upon earth, by reason of the many thousands of leagues that are between heaven and earth: Therefore the body that is at *Rome* is different from that which is at *Paris*; and that which is in heaven, is different from that which is upon earth; and consequently one and the same body cannot be at the same time at *Rome* and at *Paris*, in Heaven and upon Earth; else one and the same body might be distant and different from it self, which is a contradiction: Therefore seeing Jesus Christ is not distant, and different from himself, it follows that he cannot be at the same time in Heaven and in the Host, not at the same time in the consecrated Hosts at *Rome* and at *Paris*.

9. But perhaps it may be said that a body being at the same time in two distant places is not distant from it self, but that the places only are distant; and therefore that Christs body in heaven is not distant from it self in the Host, but it is the places only, *viz.* heaven and earth (where the Host is) that are distant. To this I answer that it is only the distance of places that makes the distance of things existing in those distant places. For example: The reason why *Peter* that is at *Rome* is distant from *Paul* that is at *Paris*, is not because they are two

things really different, else they would be always distant, even when they are in one Bed together, (for they are always really different) but all the reason of their distance is, because they are in two distant places. Seeing then (according to our Adversaries) that Christs body is in two distant places at once, *viz.* in Heaven and in the Host, at *Rome* and at *Paris* in divers Hosts, it follows that Christs body is distant, and different from it self. And seeing it is impossible that it should be distant and different from it self, it is evident that it cannot be in two distant places at once; and consequently not in Heaven and in the Host.

10. Besides, Suppose that *Peter* could be at *Rome* and at *Paris* at once, and that *Peter* that is at *Rome* should have a mind to go to *Paris*, and should go accordingly; and that the same *Peter* that is at *Paris* should have a mind to go to *Rome*, and should go accordingly, it is certain that *Peter* would draw near to himself, and meet himself. But things that draw near to each other, must of necessity have been at a distance before; and therefore if a body draws near to it self, it is certain that it was distant from it self before. And hereupon I would fain ask our Adversaries, whether, when *Peter* should meet himself, he would let himself pass, or not? and if he should let himself pass, whether

ther *Peter* going to *Rome*, would step aside and give way to himself going to *Paris*, or else the contrary? But if he should not step aside and give place to himself, I would ask whether he would hinder himself from passing, or not? and if he should not hinder himself from passing; whether he would pass thorow himself, and so make another *Janus* with two faces, &c? Whatsoever answers they shall make to these Questions must (I am sure) be very absurd and ridiculous.

11 The fifth Argument is this: It is a perfect contradiction, that a body should be one and not one: But if Christs body should be at the same time in heaven, and upon earth in the host, it would be one and not one; for it would be one by our Adversaries own confession, and it would not be one; which I prove thus: That a thing may be one, it must neither be divided in it self, nor from it self, as appears by the definition of Unity; and it is certain that nothing is divided or separated from it self: But if Christs body be at the same time in heaven and upon earth in the host, it will be divided, and separated from it self, that which is in heaven being divided and separated from that which is upon earth, because it is not in the space between both.

12. Here again it may be objected, That a body

body in divers places is divided from it self locally, because the places in which it is, are divided; but not entitatively, because it is still one and the same entity of body. To which I answer, 1. That entitative division (which is nothing else but a plurality of beings, or a plurality of things really different) is no true division, for then the three divine Persons which are really different, would also be really divided; and the body and soul of a living man which do really differ, would also be really divided. 2. I say, That if a body be divided and separated from bodies which it toucheth, it is also divided and separated from bodies which it doth not touch; and if a body be divided and separated from bodies to which it is near, it is also divided and separated from bodies that are far distant from it; but especially the division is true, when between two there be bodies of divers natures, to which there is no union. Therefore, seeing that between Christs body, which is really in heaven, and the same body which is pretendedly upon earth in the consecrated Hosts, there be divers bodies of divers natures, to which it is not united; it is evident by our Adversaries own doctrine, that Christs body is really divided and separated from it self. And seeing it is impossible it should be separated from it self, it is also im-

impos-

impossible that it should be in heaven and in the host at the same time. 3. I say, That local division takes away entitative division, and things that are divided locally, are also divided entitatively; that is, they are also really different; else no reason can be given why two glasses of water taken from the same fountain, are really different, seeing these waters are like in all things, except in reference to place; and there can no reason be given why the Ocean is not one single drop of water only, reproduced in all places occupied by the Ocean, except it be that one drop of water cannot be reproduced in all those places; but if it be possible, then Reason obligeth us to believe that it is really so, because God and Nature do nothing in vain; and it is in vain to do that by many things, which may be done by one thing: and if it be really so, then it follows, That all the Sea-battles that ever have been, were fought in one drop of water, and many thousands of men have been drowned in one drop of water, and all people since *Adam* have drunk but one drop of water, which things are absurd and ridiculous.

13. The sixth Argument is this: Jesus Christ as he is man, cannot be in divers places at once, if another man cannot be so too, because Jesus Christ, as he is man, *was made like*

unto

unto us in all things, sin only excepted, as the Apostle to the *Hebrews* observes. But another man cannot be in divers places at once; for example, *Peter* cannot be at the same time at *Paris* and at *Rome*, which I prove thus. It is impossible that *Peter* should be a man and no man at the same time: But if *Peter* could at the same time be at *Paris* and at *Rome*, he might at the same time be a man and no man, which I prove thus: He that may at the same time be both dead and alive, may at the same time be a man and no man; because he that is alive is a real man, and he that is dead is no real man, but a carcass: But if *Peter* could at the same time be at *Paris* and at *Rome*, he might be both alive and dead at the same time; for he might be mortally wounded at *Paris* and die there, and, at the same time not be hurt at *Rome*, but alive and making merry there. Besides, *Peter* might be divisibly at *Paris*, and indivisibly at *Rome*; (as Christs body, according to our Adversaries, is divisibly in heaven, and indivisibly in the host:) But if at *Paris* (where he should be divisibly) his head should be cut off, he would die, and cease to be a man; and at *Rome* (where he should be indivisibly and in a point) his head should not be cut off, and so he should remain at the same time a living and real man, which is a contradiction. In a word, *Peter* might be

at

at *Paris* in the midst of flames, and be burnt and reduced to ashes, and consequently should die, and be no man; whereas at the same time he might be at *Rome* in the River *Tiber*, sound and brisk, and consequently be a true living man: whence it follows that he might be a man, and no man, which is a contradiction.

14. To this may be added other absurdities that would follow from this Position, that one body may be in divers places at once, *viz.* That one Candle lighted might give light to all the World, if it were reproduced in all places of the World: That a great Army might be made of one man, reproduced in a hundred thousand adjoining places: That all the debts in the World might be paid with one Crown, reproduced as many times as there be Crowns due: That all the people in the World might quench their thirst with one Pottle of Wine, reproduced as many times as there be inhabitants in the World: That all the men in the World might drink in one and the same Glass, reproduced as many times as there be men in the World: (whereupon a man might be so curious as to ask, whether if this Glass should be broken at *Paris*, it would also be broken at *Rome*, *Constantinople*, and other places:) That one man reproduced in an hundred thousand places, might at the same time marry an hundred thousand

wives,

wives, and lie with them; whereupon a man might desire to know whether these women might not conceive, and every one of them be delivered of a child at the end of nine months; and consequently it may be said that one man did in one night beget a hundred thousand children, &c.

15. The seventh Argument is this: If Christs body were in the host, it would be seen there; for being there in its glory (as the *Romish* Doctors say it is) it would be there more visibly then it was when he conversed amongst men here below; because the glory of Christs body doth principally consist in the brightness and splendor of an extraordinary light, like to that which it had upon Mount *Tabor*; but who dares affirm that such a glorious body is not visible wheresoever it is; and yet it is certain that Christs body is not to be seen in the host, which is an evident sign that it is not there. But it may be said that Christs body is under the accident of the Bread, and that these accidents hide it from us. To this I answer, that (according to our Adversaries) Christs body is in the place where the substance of the Bread was: But the substance of the Bread was not under the accidents, and the accidents of the Bread were not upon their substance, for then the substance of the Bread and its accidents had been in two

different

different places, above and under being two several differences of place, and that which is under is not above, &c. Therefore Christs body cannot be under the accidents of the Bread, and consequently the accidents do not hide it from us. And seeing (as our Adversaries say) Christs body is in every part and point of the host, it must needs be in the superficies, and consequently cannot be hid or covered by the accidents of the Bread. Here again it may be said that Christs body is glorious, luminous, and visible of it self, but God hinders us from seeing it. To this I answer, That if God hinders, it is only because he is pleased so to do; and consequently if he were pleased not to hinder, he would not do it, but would permit it to be seen in the same posture as it is in the host. Whereupon I would ask our Adversaries in what posture it would be seen there, whether sitting, standing, lying, or in any other posture, or whether it would be in any posture at all? If it be in no posture, it must be without any external form, because posture or situation absolutely depends upon external form. But how can a man be seen without an external form of a man, and without being in any posture of a man? and how can Christs body be without posture, and without external form; seeing (as our Adversaries say) it is whole and entire in

the

the whole host, and occupies the whole space of a great host? But if it be sitting, or standing, or in any other posture, and with the external form of a man, and if (as they say) it be whole, and entire in a point of the host, then it will follow that a man may be seen sitting, or standing in a point; and seeing a man that is standing hath his head above and his feet below, it will follow that Jesus Christ will be seen in a point of the host with his head above and his feet below, though in a point there be nothing above or below. To this I add, That if it could be seen in the host it would appear as big as the host, because it would occupy the whole space of the host; and it would appear round, because it would be bounded by the space that the host occupies, which is round. Besides, if the host should be divided into two equal parts, it would appear less by one half, and in the form of a half circle, because it would be whole and entire in the half of the host, and occupy the space of it. It would also appear a hundred thousand times less, and in a hundred thousand several forms; for, as they say, it is whole and entire in a hundred thousand parts of the host, and occupies the spaces of them. In a word, There was never such a monstrous thing seen in the World, as Christs body would be, if it were really in the host in such a manner

ner, as our Adversaries affirm it to be.

16. The eighth Argument is this: Either the Manhood of Jesus Christ, which is pretended to be in the host, can act there, or it cannot; if it cannot act, then it follows that it cannot see, hear, know, or love, or exercise any other function of the sensitive or rational soul; But if the Manhood of Christ in the host knows nothing, nor loves nothing, then it follows that it will not be happy, because happiness chiefly consists in the knowledge and love of God. Also the Manhood of Christ in the host will be different from his Manhood in heaven; for it will know in heaven, and at the same time know nothing in the host; it will love in heaven, and love nothing in the host; it will see in heaven, and see nothing in the host. But if Christs Manhood can act in the host as it doth in heaven, then it will follow that it will open its eyes, and move its feet in a point; because, according to our Adversaries, it is whole and entire in every point of the host. And being, as they tell us, God can as easily put the whole World into a point, as he doth the whole Manhood of Christ into a point of the host; it will follow that all the parts of the World existing in a point, may do in it all those actions which they now do in a vast space, as the parts of Christs Manhood existing in a point of the host can do

in it all those actions which they do in heaven; and so in a less space then is occupied by a grain of Corn the Sun may move from East to West, the Sea may have its flouds and ebbs, and the *English* may have a Sea-fight with the *Spaniards*. In a word, A Sparrow may easily swallow all the World, seeing the World will not occupy so much space as a grain of Corn doth; and yet the World which it shall swallow, will be as great as it is at present; even as Christs body in the host, is as big and as tall as it was on the Cross, as our Adversaries affirm.

17. The ninth Argument is this: As a body cannot be in a place, except it be produced there, or that it comes, or be brought thither from some other place; so a body cannot cease to be in a place without being destroyed, or going to some other place; and consequently it Christs body ceaseth to be in the host after the consumption of the accidents, it must necessarily either perish, or go to some other place: But Christs body cannot perish, for *Jesus Christ dieth no more, Rom. 6.* And Christs body goes to no other place; for if it should go to any other place, it would go to heaven: But it cannot go to heaven, because it is there already, and a man cannot go to a place where he is already: Therefore Christs body doth not cease to be in the

host.

hoſt. Whence it follows, that either Chriſts body ſtill remains in the hoſt, and that it is impoſſible that ſhould be conſumed, or elſe that it never was in the hoſt: But every one knows by experience that the hoſts are eaten and conſumed, and that Chriſts body cannot be there after the conſumption of the accidents of the bread: Therefore it never was in the hoſt.

18. The tenth Argument is drawn from hence, That the pretended preſence of Chriſts body in the hoſt, deſtroys the nature of Chriſts body, thus: The properties of a Species are incommunicable to every other Species. For example: The properties of a man are incommunicable to a beaſt; for, ſeeing the properties flow from the eſſence, or are the very eſſence it ſelf, it is evident that if the eſſence of a Species be incommunicable to another Species, then the properties of a Species are alſo incommunicable to another: But the body and the Spirit are the two Species of ſubſtance: Therefore the properties of the Spirit cannot be communicated to the body, as the properties of the body cannot be communicated to the ſpirit. But there are two principal properties which diſtinguiſh bodies from ſpirits: The firſt is, That ſpirits are ſubſtances that are penetrable amongſt themſelves, that is, may be together in one

and the ſame place, but bodies are impenetrable ſubſtances amongſt themſelves, that is, they cannot be together in one and the ſame place. The ſecond is, That bodies are in a place circumſcriptively, that is, all the body is in all the place, but all the body is not in every part of the place, but the parts of the body are in the parts of the place; but ſpirits are in a place definitively, that is, all the ſpirit is in all the place, and all the ſpirit is in every part of the place; becauſe a ſpirit having no parts, muſt neceſſarily be all whereſoever it is. Whence I form my Argument thus: That doctrine which gives to a body the properties of a ſpirit, changes the body into a ſpirit, and conſequently deſtroys the nature of a body, ſeeing properties cannot be communicated without the eſſence: But the doctrine of the pretended preſence of Chriſts body in the hoſt, gives to a body the properties of a ſpirit, becauſe it affirms that the quantity of Chriſts body penetrates the quantity of the Bread, and is in the ſame place with it; that all the parts of Chriſts body are penetrated amongſt themſelves, and are all in one and the ſame place; and that Chriſts body is all in all the hoſt, and all in every part of the hoſt: Therefore the doctrine of the *Romiſh Church* touching the pretended preſence of Chriſts body in the hoſt, deſtroys the nature of Chriſts body.

19. The

19. The eleventh Argument is drawn from hence: That Jeſus Chriſt being ſate at Gods right hand is in a glorious eſtate: and yet the doctrine of the pretended preſence of Chriſts body in the hoſt ſubjects him to divers ignominies, *viz.* that his body goes into peoples bellies, and amongſt their excrement; that it is ſubject to be eaten by his enemies, yea by Mice and other Beaſts. Hear what *Claude de Xaintes*, a famous *Romiſh* Doctor ſaith of it, *Repet.* 5. *Chap.* 2. *Of all theſe we exclude not one from the true and corporal receiving of the Lords fleſh in the Sacrament, let him be Turk, Atheiſt, Infidel, or Hypocrite; yea, though he ſhould be the Devil himſelf incarnate.* It is alſo ſubject to be ſtoln, for about 25 years ſince a Thief was executed at *Paris* for ſtealing out of a Church the Chalice and this God in it; and the Prieſt went to the Priſon in his ſacerdotal Ornaments, and falling on his knees before the Thiefs pocket, pulled his God out of it. And as it is a God that cannot keep himſelf from being ſtoln, ſo neither can he keep himſelf from being burnt, as it appeared when the *Palace-Hal* at *Paris* was burnt. In ſhort, The hoſt, or God of the Maſs, hath been ſeen in the hands of one poſſeſſed by the Devil, and conſequently in the Devils power; yea, there are charms made by the *Romiſh* Prieſts to compel

the Devil to restore God to them. A horrible and prodigious thing to put God into the Devils power, and into a capacity of being eaten by the Devil incarnate, especially, seeing he is now glorious in heaven.

20 The twelfth Argument is drawn from hence: That God doth no miracles without necessity: But what necessity is there that he should do so many miracles in this Sacrament, *viz.* that accidents should be without a subject? that the Bread should be converted into Christs body, which is already? that Christs body should be in a point, and in a hundred thousand places at once? What necessity is there that it should be eaten by wicked men, by Beasts, and by Devils incarnate? What necessity is there that it should be carried away by the Devil, that it should be stoln, burnt, *&c.* Can it be said that it is for the salvation of the soul of him that eats it? But Reprobates, as our Adversaries confess, eat it too; and the Faithful under the Old Testament did not eat it, nor do the little children of Believers under the New, and yet they are saved for all that. Can it be said with *Bellarmin* and *Perron*, that the host being eaten, serves as an incorruptible seed for a glorious Resurrection? But the Faithful of the Old Testament, and the little children of Believers under the New, will rise again gloriously, though they never participated

ted of the Eucharist. And St. *Paul* tells us *Rom.* 8. that this seed of the resurrection of our Bodies is not Christs flesh, but his Spirit, in these words, *If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, he shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*

21. Lastly, The holy Scripture is clear in this matter; for Jesus Christ is ascended into heaven, *Acts* 1. *And the heavens must contain him until the time of the restitution of all things*, *Acts* 3. and he himself saith, *I leave the World and go to the Father*, St. *John* 16. *The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always*, St. *Matth.* 26. To which may be added what Jesus Christ saith, St. *Matth.* 24. viz. *In the last days false Prophets will come, that shall say, Christ is here or there, and that he is in the secret chambers*, (or Cabinets) which cannot be but by the doctrine of the *Romish Church*, which puts Christs body in divers places, and shuts it up in several Cabinets on their Altars; and it is very remarkable that in the Greek it is ἐν ταμείοις, that is, in the Cupboards, ταμεῖον being properly a Cupboard to keep meat in.

CHAP. V.

Against the adoration or worshiping of the Host.

1. AGainst the adoration of the host, I form three Propositions; The first is this, We are not obliged to adore or worship God every where, or in all places where he is, at least not with external adoration, but we are only obliged to worship him in all places where he appears in his glorious Majesty. The first part of this Proposition, *viz.* That we are not obliged to worship God in all places where he is, appears by the practice of all Christians. For God being every where, and consequently in Stones, Trees, Beasts, Devils, and all other Creatures, there is no man so extravagant as to fall on his knees before a Tree, an Ass, or a Devil, that he may worship God in them, who is as really present in them, as he is in heaven.

2. The second part of this Proposition, *viz.* that we are only obliged to worship God both with internal and external adoration in all places where he appears in his glorious Majesty, is proved, first, by the commands which Jesus Christ gave his Apostles when they asked him

him how they ſhould pray; for he anſwers them thus; *When ye pray, ſay, Our Father which art in Heaven*, St. *Matth.* 6. St. *Luke* 11. Why doth he ſay, *which art in heaven*, and not which art on Earth, or in the Sea, or in the Air, ſeeing God is equally in all theſe places? but only becauſe God appears in heaven in his glorious Majeſty and there crowns all the bleſſed Spirits with his glory. Secondly, When God appeared to *Moſes* in the burning buſh, which was not conſumed, he ſaid to him, *Take thy ſhoes from off thy feet, for the place where thou ſtandeſt is holy ground*, *Exod.* 3. Why is this ground called holy, and *Moſes* commanded to approach it with reverence, ſubmiſſion, and adoration, ſeeing any other ground is equally Gods creatures, and that he is equally preſent every where? but only becauſe God did manifeſt ſomewhat of his power and glory in that place, by cauſing the Buſh to burn without being conſumed. Thirdly, *Joſhua and the Iſraelites did proſtrate themſelves before the Ark of the Covenant*, *Joſhua* 7. 6. becauſe God appeared there in a peculiar and glorious manner, for, from the Mercy-ſeat which covered it, he gave his oracles and made known his will, *Exod.* 25. 22. *Numb.* 7.

Fourthly, When the Prieſt celebrates Maſs, a little before the conſecration, he recommends the *ſurſum corda*, that is, the lifting up of their hearts;

hearts; Why the lifting them up, seeing God is equally both above and below? but only because God appears above in heaven in his glorious majesty; and consequently it is thither that we must direct our Vows, our Prayers, and our Worship.

3. The second Proposition is this: We are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in the water of Baptism, though he be really there in regard of all that is adorable in him. The first part of this Proposition, *viz.* That we are not obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the Water of Baptism, is chiefly proved by the practice of all Christians; for no man ever fell on his knees before the Water of Baptism and adored Jesus Christ in it, at least not with external worship, which is only here intended; and doubtless the reason is, because Jesus Christ discovers no beam of his glory there, nor doth he appear in the Water of Baptism any more then in other waters; so that as we are not obliged to worship God, save only where he appears in his glorious Majesty, as hath been proved, so neither are we obliged to worship Jesus Christ, but only where he discovers some beam of his glory, which he doth not in the Water of Baptism.

4. The second part of this Proposition, *viz.* That Jesus Christ is really present in the Water of Baptism in respect of all that is to be adored

red in him, is proved thus: All that is of it self adorable in Jesus Christ, is either his Godhead, or his divine Person, or his divine Attributes. As for his Godhead, seeing it is really every where it cannot be denied but that it is also in the Water of Baptism. As for his Person, seeing it is divine, and eternal, and infinite, it is really every where, and consequently in the Water of Baptism: and as for his divine attributes, seeing they are not really different from the Godhead, or the person of Jesus Christ, it necessarily follows, that seeing the Godhead and Person of Jesus Christ, are really in the Water of Baptism, his divine Attributes must really be there likewise.

5. The third Proposition is this: We are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in the host, though he be really there in respect of all that is to be adored in him, *viz.* in respect of his Godhead, his divine Person, and his divine Attributes; yea, though he were there invisibly in respect of his Manhood too. The principal reason of this hath been toucht upon already, *viz.* That as we are not obliged to worship God in all places where he is (at least not with external worship) but there only where he appears in his glorious Majesty, *viz.* ordinarily in heaven, and extraordinarily elsewhere, as hath been proved in the first Proposition,

ſition. And as we are not obliged to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt in the Water of Baptiſm with external adoration, though he be really there in reſpect of all that is adorable in him, becauſe he doth not diſcover the leaſt beam of his glory there, nor appears in the Water of Baptiſm more then in other waters, as hath been proved in the ſecond Propoſition: Even ſo we are not obliged to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt in the hoſt with external adoration, although he be there in reſpect of all that is to be adored in him, yea, though he were there in reſpect of his Manhood tood; becauſe Jeſus Chriſt doth not diſcover any beam of his glory there, nor doth he appear in the conſecrated hoſts any more then in thoſe that are not conſecrated, for no man can diſtinguiſh the one from the other. And as for his Manhood which is pretended to be there inviſibly, I ſay that there is no ſenſible mark of its preſence, and conſequently nothing which obligeth us to external worſhip, for the ſame reaſon as is already alledged; for if the inviſible preſence of the Godhead, divine Perſon, and divine Attributes of Jeſus Chriſt which are of themſelves adorable, do not oblige us to external worſhip in the Water of Baptiſm, why ſhould the Manhood of Jeſus Chriſt, which is not of it ſelf adorable, oblige us to external adoration

though

though it were in the Hoſt, it being there only, as they ſay, inviſibly? In a word, They muſt ſhew us the diſparity, and tell us the reaſon why we are not obliged to adore Jeſus Chriſt with external worſhip in the Water of Baptiſm, though he be really there preſent in reſpect of all that which is adorable in him, *viz.* in reſpect of his Godhead, his divine Perſon, and his divine Attributes, and yet are obliged to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt in the Hoſt with an external worſhip, though nothing renders him more adorable there then in the water of Baptiſm.

6. To this the Jeſuite *S. Rigaut*, one of the moſt learned of his Order, anſwers, That although there be nothing in the conſecrated Hoſt that renders him more adorable then in the Water of Baptiſm; yet there is ſomething in the Hoſt which obligeth us to external worſhip, which is not in the Water of Baptiſm; becauſe, ſaith he, the Manhood of Jeſus Chriſt is in the Hoſt, and is there in ſtead of a ray of glory; and God will be adored in all places, where the Manhood perſonally united to the Godhead, is preſent: But in the Water of Baptiſm Jeſus Chriſt diſcovers no beam of his glory, and his Manhood which is equivalent to a ray of glory, is not there.

7. To this I reply, That the rays or beams of glory which oblige us to external adoration in

a

a certain place, must be sensibly in that place. And therefore seeing the Manhood of Jesus Christ which is pretended and supposed to be really present in the host, is neither visible nor sensible, it cannot be equivalent to a beam of glory. To which I add, That as the Godhead and divine Person of Jesus Christ which are equally present in the Water of Baptism, and in the Host, do not oblige us to external worship, for this only reason, *viz.* because they do not discover any ray of their glory there: so neither doth the Manhood of Jesus Christ, pretended and supposed to be really present in the host, oblige us to external adoration, for this only reason, *viz.* because it appears not there, nor discovers any ray of its glory. Lastly, I affirm that by the very doctrine and practice of the *Romish* Church it self, we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in all places where his Manhood is, because, as the *Romish* Doctors confess, we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in that host which the Priest hath newly eaten, and whose accidents are not yet destroyed; nor in that host which is lockt up in the Cupboard that is on the Altar; nor in that host which a Priest carries under his Cloak to a sick person in the Country.

8. To this the same Jesuite answers, That although the glory of Christs Manhood appears not

not to our bodily eyes, yet it appears to the eyes of our soul, *viz.* to our faith; for the greatest glory of Christs Manhood consists in its being personally united to the Godhead, and in being sustained in a peculiar manner by the Word. Suppose then, says he, that Jesus Christ be in the host, we are sure that it is personally united to the Godhead; and consequently, the glory of Christs Manhood, which consists in this personal union, doth certainly appear to our Faith, which is sufficient to oblige us to an external adoration of Jesus Christ in the Host.

9. To this I reply, That there is a twofold glory of God, and of Jesus Christ, or of his Manhood, *viz.* the one essential, internal, and hid from our senses; the other accidental, external and apparent to our senses: the essential and internal glory of God which is hid from our senses, consists in the eminence of his perfections, which are to be infinite, almighty, most wise, *&c.* and the accidental and external glory of God, which appears to our senses, consists in some miraculous and extraordinary effect, which is sensible; as when God caused a Bush to burn without being consumed, when he pronounced his Oracles from above the Mercy-seat; and when, being made man, and having manifested himself in the flesh, he commanded

the

the Winds and the Waves, cast out Devils, raised the dead, &c. But I affirm that we are not obliged to worship God with an external adoration in all places where he is, in his essential and internal glory only, although it appears to our Faith, because God being every where with this essential, and internal glory, we should be obliged to worship him with an external adoration in Trees, in Beasts, yea and in Devils too, which is absurd: But we are only obliged to worship God with external worship in all places where he makes his essential and internal glory appear by some accidental and external glory, *viz.* by some miraculous or extraordinary effect, which is sensible, and equivalent to a ray of his essential and internal glory, as appears by what is said in the first Propolition. In like manner the personal union of the Godhead and Manhood, being an essential glory of Jesus Christ, and an internal glory of his Manhood, wholly hid from our senses, doth not oblige us to the external adoration of Jesus Christ, although it certainly appears to our Faith, except it be accompanied with an external and sensible glory; for if the essential and internal glory of the Godhead and divine Person of Jesus Christ, which appear equally present to our Faith in the Water of Baptism, do not oblige us to an external adoration of

Jesus

Jesus Christ, except it be accompanied with an accidental, external and sensible glory; why should the internal glory of Christs Manhood, which is infinitely beneath the essential and internal glory of the Godhead, and appears present to the Faith of those of the *Romish* Church, oblige them to the external adoration of Jesus Christ, if it be separated from all external and sensible glory? To this I add, That according to the doctrine and practice of the *Romish* Church, we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ with external adoration in all places where the personal union of the Manhood with the Word, appears to the Faith of those of that Church; for we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in that host which a Priest hath newly swallowed; nor in that host which is locket up, nor in that host which a Priest carries under his Cloak to a sick person in the Country; although the essential glory of Jesus Christ, and the internal glory of his Manhood (which this Jesuite makes to consist in the personal union of the Manhood with the Word) appear certain to the Faith of those of the *Romish* Church.

10. To this the Jesuite answers, That as if we would obtain any grace from God, considered as he really exists in a stone, we should be obliged to prostration and external worship of the Godhead really present in that stone:

so, if we would obtain any grace from Jesus Christ really existing in the host, we are obliged to approach unto it with reverence, and external adoration; and consequently we are obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the host with external adoration whensoever we would obtain any grace from him, as he exists in the host.

11. To this I reply, That as we are never obliged to beg grace of God, as he exists in a stone, except he discovers some beam of his glory there, (for it is sufficient to beg grace of God, considered as he exists in heaven, where he appears in his glorious Majesty, according to the command of Jesus Christ, *when ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven,* and according to the command of the Apostles, *lift up your hearts*) so we are never obliged to beg grace of God or Jesus Christ, considered as existing in the host, because he discovers no ray of his glory there; but it is sufficient to beg grace of God or Jesus Christ, considered as existing in heaven, because he always appears there in his glorious Majesty. Therefore as we are never obliged to beg grace of God, considered as existing in a stone, so we are never obliged to adore him there: and as we are never obliged to beg grace of God or Jesus Christ, considered as existing in the host, so we are never obliged

ged to adore him there with external adoration.

12. To this the Jeſuit anſwers, That God hath done many miracles by this Sacrament, and in it, both by puniſhing prophane perſons, and the deſpiſers of it; and alſo by making a little child appear upon the Altar, or fleſh in ſtead of the bread, or bloud in ſtead of the wine; all which ought to be acknowledged as ſo many rays of the glory of Chriſts Manhood, and that they ever oblige us to the external adoration of Jeſus Chriſt in the hoſt.

13. To this I reply, That I do not at all doubt but that God hath many times puniſhed prophane perſons, and the contemners of this Sacrament, both ordinarily and extraordinarily; for St. *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 11. tells us that many of thoſe that did receive this Sacrament unworthily, were ſick, and many ſlept, that is, were dead: and St. *Cyprian* in the Treatiſe of thoſe that fall, obſerves Gods judgment againſt wicked and prophane perſons, and the contemners of this Sacrament. But as for thoſe apparitions of Jeſus Chriſt in form of a child, and of fleſh and bloud, *&c.* I look on them as fabulous ſtories invented by Monks and other ſuperſtitious perſons, above ſeven or eight hundred years after Chriſt, when the doctrine of the real preſence of Chriſts Manhood in the hoſt, began

to prevail, and was powerfully opposed by Gods people in those days.

14. Secondly, I say, That although there had been such apparitions yet we must not infer from thence, either the presence of Christs Manhood, or external adoration; because that is not Christs flesh which seems to be so; and these apparitions may be illusions of the Devil. The Jesuite *Vasquez* in *Disput.* 193. *chap.* 2. speaks thus. *I answer, That which appears is not the flesh of Christ, nor of any other that is really flesh; but it is only an effigies, or appearance of flesh, as* St. Thomas *saith: and whereas the simple are deceived, and do believe that Christs flesh is there in a divisible and bloudy manner, it is no great matter, and this deceit must be corrected by the right instruction of the Doctors.* *Gabriel Biell*, a famous Doctor of the *Romish* Church, *Lesson* 51. upon the *Canon of the Mass*, saith, *That such apparitions of flesh and bloud may be made by the illusions of the Devil, to deceive the simple, God permitting it to be so*; and he gives an example of it, *viz. That in a Convent of Minor Friers at* Isennes *in* Thuringia, *a certain person like unto an Angel, appeared to a Lay-Frier that was preparing himself for the Communion, and thrust into his mouth a piece of flesh, which as soon as he had swallowed, he was possessed, and grievously tormented by the Devil.* The Jesuit *Suarez*,

Tom.

Tom. 3. Disp. 55. Sect. 3. speaks thus. *Experience tells us that by length of time this flesh and this blood which appear in the Eucharist, are changed and corrupted.* But when this happens, saith that famous *Romish* Doctor *Alexander Hales*, *Sent. 4. Quæst. 11. It is a sign that the apparition which was made in this form, was not made by the power of God, but by the power of the Devil, or by the craft of man.*

15. Thirdly, If it were as true as it is false, that Jesus Christ hath appeared sometimes in the Sacrament of the Eucharist in the form of a little child, or of flesh and of blood; yet I say, that as God, when he appeared to *Moses* in the Bush that burned without being consumed, was to be worshiped there, for this only reason, because he discovered a beam of his glory by causing the Bush to burn without being consumed; but it doth not follow that God must be worshiped in all other Bushes, though he be as really in them as he was in that, for this only reason, because he doth not discover in them any ray of his glory: so, if Jesus Christ hath sometimes appeared visibly in the host (which I do not grant) I think then he should have been worshiped, because of such a visible appearance, which is equivalent to a ray of glory; but it follows not that Jesus Christ must be adored in other hosts, where his Manhood ap-

pears not, though it be really there, for this only reason, because no ray of his glory appears there.

16. To the three foregoing Propositions I add this Argument, which is very considerable: In lawful adoration it is requisite that he that adores, be well assured that what he adores is the true God, else he may justly be reproached, as Jesus Christ reproached the woman of *Samaria*, *Ye worship ye know not what*. But the *Romanists* can never be assured (according to their own maxims) that the host which they worship is the true God; and they have always cause to suspect that they worship a morsel of Bread in stead of the Redeemer of the World; because according to their own doctrine, the real presence of Christs body in the host depends on lawful consecration; and lawful consecration depends on the quality of the Priest, and on the pronouncing of the words of consecration, and on his intention in pronouncing them; for there is no consecration (as they say) when either he that celebrates Mass is no Priest, or doth not pronounce the words that are essentially requisite to consecration, *viz. this is my body*, &c. or doth not pronounce them with intention to consecrate; and consequently in these cases the host remains meer bread. But it is impossible certainly to know these three things:

things: For as for the quality of the Prieſt, he muſt have been baptized; and he that baptized him muſt have obſerved the eſſential form of Baptiſm, and have had intention to baptize him: Again, he muſt have received Ordination from a true Biſhop; and the Biſhop muſt have obſerved the eſſential form of Ordination, and have had intention to make him a Prieſt; and to make this Biſhop a true Biſhop, he muſt have been baptized in due form, and with the requiſite intention, and muſt have received Ordination in due form, and with the requiſite intention from other Biſhops; and they again, for the making them true Biſhops, muſt alſo have received Baptiſm and Ordination in due form, and with the requiſite intention, from other true Biſhops, and theſe from others, and ſo back to the Apoſtles. But who can be aſſured that from the Apoſtles to a Biſhop, or Prieſt, now adays, there hath been no failing, either in the eſſential form of Baptiſm or Ordination, or in the requiſite intention? As for the pronouncing of the words requiſite to conſecration, none but the Prieſt can know whether he hath pronounced them or not, becauſe in the celebration of the Maſs, thoſe words are pronounced ſo ſoftly, that no perſon preſent can hear them. And as for the intention, it is evident that no man but him-

self can know it. Besides, It is known that some Priests are Magicians, as *Lewis Goffredi*, and other wicked Priests, who do neither consecrate in due form, nor with the requisite intention, especially such as believe nothing of what they profess; yea, divers Monks and Priests that have been converted to our Religion, have assured us that for a long time before their conversion they did abhor the Idolatry that was practised in the adoration of the host. Judge then if such persons as these had any intention to consecrate in the celebration of the Mass.

17. The *Romish* Doctors have sought all the remedies imaginable to prevent this danger. Pope *Adrian Quest.* 3. speaks thus: *In the adoration of the Eucharist, there is always a tacite condition, viz. if the consecration be duly made; (as hath been decided at the Council of Constance) otherwise they could not be excused from idolatry, that worship the host when the Priest pretends to celebrate, but celebrates not; or pretends to celebrate, and is no Priest, as it many times happens.* Observe these words, *is many times happens*, for they shew that there is great cause of doubting, and that much caution must be used. For, as if a woman, in her husbands absence, should say to a man that comes to her, and tells her he is her husband, (and she hath probable grounds

to

to ſuſpect him) *If thou art my husband I will receive thee*, and thereupon endeavours to clear it before ſhe admits him to any privacy; this condition frees her promiſe from blame; but if ſhe gives her ſelf up to him, before ſhe clears this doubt, ſaying, *I will receive thee if thou art my husband*, this condition doth not free her action from blame, but ſhe will be reputed an adultereſs. Even ſo if a man to whom an hoſt is propoſed to be adored, and he hath reaſon to doubt whether it ought to be adored, ſhould only ſay, *If thou art Chriſt I will adore thee*, and ſhould not adore it before he be well aſſured of it, this condition would render him blameleſs; but if, notwithſtanding his doubt, he adores it, this condition, *if thou art Chriſt, I adore thee*, doth not exempt him from the crime of Idolatry; for to what purpoſe is the condition, whether it be tacite, or expreſt, *I adore thee if thou art Chriſt*, becauſe he actually adores it, without knowing whether it be ſo or not.

18. To what hath been ſaid, I add, That the Primitive Church never adored the hoſt, nor believed that the body and bloud of Chriſt were really and inviſibly in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; for if the Chriſtians of the Primitive Church had believed it, they had furniſhed the Heathens with ſpecious pretences to excuſe the idolatry of their Image-worſhip, and

to

to retort upon the Christians those very arguments which they had made use of against them.

19. First, The Heathens did maintain that their Idols were composed of two things, *viz.* of a visible Image and an invisible Deity dwelling in it. *They bring their gods*, saith St. *Chrysostom* in *Theodoret* in *Atrep*, *into their base images of wood and stone, and shut them up there as in a prison. Your gods*, saith *Arnobius*, Book 6. *dwell in Plaister and Baked Earth; and, that they may make these materials more venerable, they suffer themselves to be shut up, and to remain hid and detained in an obscure Prison.* But might not the Heathens have justly replied to the Ancient Christians, if they had believed what the *Romish* Doctors do now adays. And do not you believe the very same of your host, that it is composed of two things, *viz.* of the visible species of bread, and the invisible body of Christ, which is hid under the species? Doth not your Christ dwell in baked dough, and that he may make a piece of bread more venerable, doth he not suffer himself to be shut up, and doth he not remain hid, as in a Prison?

20. Secondly, The Heathens held that consecration was the means whereby the Deity, which they adored, was made present in the Image. So *Tertullian* in his *Apolog. chap.* 12. saith,

saith, *I find nothing to object against Images, but that the matter of them is such as our Frying-pans and Kettles are made of, which changeth its destiny by consecration.* And *Minutius Felix* speaks thus of a Pagan Image, *Behold it is melted, forged, fashioned, and yet it is not God; behold it is gilded, finished, erected, and yet it is not God; behold it is adorned, consecrated, and worshiped, and then it is God.* And *Arnobius* in Book 6. *Dedication or Consecration makes them dwell in Images, they refuse not to dwell in habitations of Earth, or rather, being forced to go into them by the right of Dedication, they are incorporated, and joined to the Images.* But might not the Heathens have replied to the Christians thus. We find it just so in your Eucharist, *viz.* that the signs are of the same matter with our common Bread and Wine, but change their destiny by consecration; behold it is kneaded, and moulded, and yet it is not God; behold it is baked in the Oven, and yet it is not God; behold it is consecrated and adored, and then it is God; for your Christ doth not refuse to enter into these earthy matters, or rather, being forced to go into them by the right of consecration, he is incorporated and joined to the species of the Bread and Wine.

21. Thirdly, The Heathens had both great and little Images, and did believe that the Deity which they worshiped, was as well in the little

as in the great ones. *Arnobius* in Book 6. jears them for this, saying, that, *If their Gods had their great and little Images in which they dwelt, they must needs be straightned for want of room in the little ones, whereas in the great ones they might stretch themselves out at their full length.* But might not the Heathens have reproached the Christians of those times in the same manner if they had believed that Jesus Christ had been wholly contained as well in a little host as in a great one, and as well in the least part of the host as in the greatest?

22. Lastly, The Heathens were reproached for worshiping Wood and Stone, the work of mens hands; things that cannot see, hear, smell, taste, breath, speak, or move; things expoled to age, rust, corruption, dust, falling, breaking, burning, &c. to the injuries of Worms, Mice, and other Beasts; subject to the power of Enemies, to be stoln, lockt up, &c. as you may read in *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Minutius Felix*, and other ancient Doctors of the Church. But if those ancient Christians had believed what the Romanists now do, might not the Heathens have replied thus; And can you deny that the host which you worship is the work of a mans hands, that moulded it, and gave it such a form as pleased him, and then consecrated it with certain words to make your Christ come into it

it whole and entire? Do not you adore your host, which neither sees, nor hears, nor smells, nor breaths, nor walks, nor speaks, nor moves? Is not your host subject to age, dust, selling, burning, to Worms, to Mice, and other Beasts? Is it not subject to be taken away, stolen, lockt up, &c. But if it be said that the accidents of the host are only subject to these inconveniences, and not Jesus Christ that is under them, I answer that the Heathens had said the same, *viz.* that their Gods were not subject to these inconveniences, but the Images only in which they were; for in *Arnobius* his 6. Book, they speak thus: *We believe not the Copper, Gold, and Silver, whereof the Images are made, to be Gods and Deities, that of themselves deserve adoration; but in these materials we adore those that sacred dedication introduceth, and causeth to dwell in the Images.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Against the taking away of the Cup.

1. THE taking away of the Eucharistical Cup was established as an Article of Faith by the *Romish* Church Representative, assembled in Council at *Constance*, *Anno* 1415. *Session* 13. in a Canon, the chief clauses whereof are these: *Seeing that in divers parts of the World there be some who rashly presume to say, that Christian people ought to partake of the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both species of the Bread and Wine, and do give the Communion to Lay-people, not only under the species of the Bread, but also under the species of the Wine; this present holy general Council of Constance, lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Ghost, being desirous to provide for the safety of the faithful against this errour, doth therefore declare, decree, and determine, that although Jesus Christ did administer this venerable Sacrament to his Disciples under both the species of Bread and Wine; and although in the Primitive Church the Faithful did receive this Sacrament under both species, yet notwithstanding that (for the avoiding of certain dangers and scandals) this custom, which was introduced with reason, ought*

to

to be kept, viz. *that Prieſts that ſay Maſs ſhall communicate under both the ſpecies of the Bread and Wine, but that Lay-perſons ſhall communicate under the ſpecies of Bread only: and they that ſhall ſay the contrary, ought to be expelled as Hereticks, and grievouſly puniſhed by the Biſhops, or their Officials.* This Canon was confirmed by the ſucceeding *Romiſh* Councils, and particularly by the Council of *Trent*.

2. Againſt ſo horrible a Canon and ſo ſtrange a Law, it is very difficult to oppoſe any thing; for, if you tell them that this Law is contrary to the Inſtitution and command of Jeſus Chriſt, they freely confeſs it; ſeeing that although Jeſus Chriſt did inſtitute and adminiſter the Euchariſt under both ſpecies, yet they will not have it ſo practiſed. If you tell them that this Law is contrary to the command of St. *Paul*, and practice of the Primitive Church, they ingeniouſly own it; for they openly declare, that although the Faithful in the Primitive Church did receive the Sacrament of the Euchariſt under both ſpecies, yet they that practiſe it thus ought to be expelled and puniſhed as Hereticks. This is the true way of ending all Controverſies, and of keeping us from diſputing with them. For example, If we alledge that St. *Paul* 1 *Tim.* 4. ſaith, that *they who forbid to marry, and command to abſtain from meats, do teach the doctrines*

doctrines of Devils; they need only answer, That although St. *Paul* doth say so, yet we must not believe it, because the *Romish* Church hath determined otherwise. Again, If we alledge, That the same Apostle *Ephes.* 2. saith, that *we are saved by grace, through faith; and that not of our selves, it is the gift of God; not of works, least any man should boast*; they need only answer, That although this was written by the Apostle, yet we must not believe it, because the *Romish* Church hath determined, that we are saved by works and faith as coming from our selves, and from the strength of our own free will, &c. And now I leave you to judge whom we ought to follow, whether these lying Doctors, or Jesus Christ and his Apostles. But that which I find utterly insupportable is this, *viz.* that they accuse of rashness, errour, and heresie, those that by obeying Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and following the practice of the Primitive Church, do affirm that we ought to partake of the Cup as well as of the Bread. Again, I find it an insufferable piece of impudence, that they boast so much of antiquity, and of the conformity of their Creed to that of the Primitive Church, and yet can so openly renounce both in this chief and principal point of doctrine.

3. Here the *Romish* Doctors now adays think to

to shelter themselves, by telling us it is true that Jesus Christ did institute the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both the species of the Bread and Wine; and that the Primitive Church did so celebrate it, not by any express command of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, but meerly by Ecclesiastical policy, which may be changed, as several occasions and circumstances require. And they add, That it is sufficient to observe that which is of the essence of the Sacrament, *viz.* to receive the body and bloud of Christ; but that the Church may change that which is accidental, *viz.* to receive them under both the species, or under one species only; for they will have it, that the bloud of Christ is under the species of the Bread, by concommitance, and that his body is under the species of the Wine by concommitance; because Jesus Christ being now glorious, his body and bloud cannot be separated.

4. To this I reply, First, That there is an express command of Jesus Christ to take the Cup and drink, St. *Matth.* 26. in these words, *drink ye all of it.* To this the *Romish* Doctors answer, That the word *all* is not extended to all men; for then we should say that the Eucharistical Cup ought to be given to *Turks*, *Jews*, and all other *Infidels*. And they add, that the word *all* doth not extend to all those that are of the body

of the Church of the Elect, for then the Eucharistical cup should be given to little children, whom God hath elected to eternal life: But say they, the word *all* is extended only to all those, to whom Jesus Christ gave the cup, *viz.* to the Apostles, considered as they were Pastors.

5. To this I reply, That although Jesus Christ gave this command to drink of the Eucharistical cup to his Apostles only, yet we must know in what quality they received this command. But it was not in the quality of Apostles, for then none but Apostles could partake of the cup; and there being now no more Apostles, it should be quite taken away, and so Mass could be no more celebrated. And it was not in quality of Pastors, or sacrificing Priests; for Jesus Christ was then the only Sacrificer, as the *Romish* Doctors say, and the Apostles did not then exercise the function of sacrificing Priests. Besides it belongs to Pastors, and those that administer the Sacraments, being publick persons to give, but to private persons to receive only: But the Apostles in the celebration of the Eucharist, did only receive of Jesus Christ their Master and Pastor: Therefore they received the command to drink of the cup, as they were Believers. Whence it follows that all the faithful that partake of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, are obliged by the command of Jesus

Jesus Christ to drink of the cup. So then the *Romish* Doctors are mistaken when they tell us that none but Priests that sacrifice, have a right to drink of the cup, and that those Priests that do not sacrifice, must communicate under the species of the bread only, for at that time the Apostles did not sacrifice. To this may be added, that if the command of Jesus Christ, *drink ye all of it*, was spoken to Pastors only, because they to whom Christ spake were Pastors; then it follows that the command of Jesus Christ, *Take, eat*, was spoken to Pastors, because they to whom Jesus Christ spake were Pastors; and so the people will not be obliged by any command to communicate under the species of the bread, and consequently will be wholy deprived of the Sacrament, which is very absurd and contrary to Christian Religion.

6. Secondly, I say, That in 1 *Cor.* 11. there is an express command to all the Faithful to drink of the cup, in these words, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup.* In which words the Apostle speaks to all Believers, who, no doubt, have cause to examine themselves. And this is apparent, because St. *Paul* directs his Epistle (and consequently these words) to all those of the Church of *Corinth*, as well Lay-men as Ecclesiastical; for in *chap.* 1. *vers.* 2. he directs it to

all that in every place call upon the name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord. To this I add, That Jeſus Chriſt doth not only ſay, *as often as ye eat this bread*, but alſo, *as often as ye drink this cup ye do ſhew the Lords death till he come*; ſo that we do as much commemorate Chriſts death by partaking of the cup in the Euchariſt, as we do by partaking of the bread. And this is very proper, for ſeeing that not only the body of Chriſt was broken, but alſo his bloud ſhed on the Croſs; and that in every propitiation and expiation for ſin, the effuſion of bloud was very conſiderable (becauſe it repreſents death better then any thing elſe doth) it is certain that they do not celebrate the memory of Chriſts death as they ought, that do not partake of this part of the Sacrament, whereby only we commemorate the effuſion of Chriſts bloud.

7. Thirdly, I ſay, that in the diſpute about the Euchariſt, our Adverſaries do alledge to us the words of Jeſus Chriſt in *chap. 6.* of St. *Johns* Goſpel, *Except ye drink the bloud of the ſon of man, ye have no life in you.* Why then do they deprive the people of life, by taking the cup from them and hindering them from drinking? And it is not at all to the purpoſe here to alledge concommitance, and to tell us that by taking Chriſts body under the ſpecies of the bread, we take his bloud alſo, becauſe 'tis inſeparable from

from his body. For, to this I anſwer, Firſt, That to take Chriſts bloud in taking the hoſt, is not to drink it: But Jeſus Chriſt ſaith expreſly, Except a man drink his bloud he hath no life in him. Secondly, I ſay, That although in ſome places by the body, ſhould be meant the body and bloud too, yet it could not be in thoſe places where a manifeſt diſtinction is made between the body and the bloud: But in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt this diſtinction is very apparent; for Jeſus Chriſt gave firſt the Sacrament and ſign of his body, in theſe words, *Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you*; and then ſeparately the Sacrament of his bloud, in theſe words, *Drink ye all of it, for this is my bloud, which is ſhed for you.* And he not only ſpeaks of them ſeparately, but repreſents them as really ſeparated in his death; for he ſaith, *my body broken for you, and my bloud ſhed for you.* In which words there is no place for concomitance; for the body broken by divers wounds doth not contain the bloud, and the bloud being ſhed, is not contained in the body. Alſo our Adverſaries affirm, that the ſacramental words do operate that which they ſignifie; But by their own confeſſion, they ſignifie the ſeparation of Chriſts body from his bloud, as Card. *Perron* acknowledgeth in his reply to the King of *Great Britain*, *pag.* 1108. in theſe words, *The*

scope of the entireness of this Sacrament, is to put us in mind that this body and this bloud which we receive, were divided by his death on the Cross; whence St. *Paul* saith, *as often as we eat this bread, and drink this cup, we shew the Lords death till he come.* Thirdly, I say, That as he that eats bread dipt in wine, hath indeed wine in his mouth, but doth not drink it; so he that should eat or swallow a consecrated host, would not drink Christs bloud, though it were in it.

8. Lastly, I say, That seeing the Sacraments were instituted to assure us the more of the truth of Gods promises, and that all our comfort depends on this perswasion, that all Gods promises are most true; it necessarily follows, that as much of the Sacrament as is taken away, so much of the certainty of this perswasion is diminished. And 'tis to no purpose to say that one part of the Sacrament doth as much confirm Gods promises as the whole Sacrament doth; for if it be so, then God hath unnecessarily instituted two Sacraments; for it had been enough to have instituted Baptism only, seeing it is ordained to confirm Gods promises. But, if for such a confirmation two Sacraments are better then one, and if two pledges, and two seals for that purpose, are of more consequence then one alone; then in one Sacrament also, two signs are of more weight then one alone,

alone, for the confirmation of Gods promises. and seeing it is said St. *Luke* 22. and *1 Cor.* 11. that the cup is the New Testament, and the New Covenant in the bloud of Christ, because it is the Sacrament of it, why then are people deprived of it?

9. As for the imaginary dangers and scandals which the *Romish* Doctors find in peoples partaking of the cup, I say in general, that Jesus Christ (in whom the treasures of wisdom are hid, and in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily) foresaw them as well as they; and yet he instituted and administred the cup, and commanded all to drink of it. And St. *Paul* who was extraordinarily inspired by the Holy Ghost, doth (notwithstanding these pretended dangers and scandals) command the *Corinthians*, as well Lay persons as Ecclesiastical, to drink of the cup, as hath been already proved.

10. The first inconvenience which our Adversaries find in peoples partaking of the cup, is that they fear they may dip their moustaches in the Chalice, and so the bloud of Christ may remain on some hair of the moustache; also they fear that the species of the wine, and consequently Christs bloud, may fall to the ground, and being fallen it cannot be gathered up again.

To this I answer: First, That Women,

Eunuchs, and such young men as have no beards, ought not to be excluded.

Secondly, It is better to be without Moustaches then without the participation of the whole Sacrament.

Thirdly, This inconvenience proceeds only from a false supposition, *viz.* that Christs bloud is under the species of the wine; but if in the Sacrament of the Eucharist there be nothing but Bread and Wine in substance, and any of it should fall to the ground accidentally, and not through any fault of ours, this inconvenience is not great enough to violate the institution and command of Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

11. The second inconvenience is, That it is almost impossible to observe this Law where there is a great number of people and but one Priest.

To this I answer, First, That in places where there is much people, as in Cities, there are divers Priests.

Secondly, If one Priest be not enough, another must be called from some neighbouring place.

Thirdly, That which cannot be done in one day, must be done in two or three days, rather then the command of Jesus Christ should be violated, and the practice of the Primitive Church abandoned.

12. The

12. The third inconvenience is, that some have a natural antipathy, or aversion to Wine, and consequently cannot drink of the cup.

To this I answer, That because corporal actions do depend on certain natural powers, they are supposed to be commanded to those that have natural powers proper to exercise those actions, and to none else. For example, The hearing of Gods Word is not commanded to deaf persons, but to those that can hear it; but drinking of Wine is a corporal action, and therefore commanded to those only that can drink it. So that if the cup must be taken from all Lay-people, because some of them have a natural antipathy to Wine; then the preaching of the Gospel must be taken from Christians, because some of them are deaf and cannot hear it.

13. The fourth inconvenience is, That there are some Countries where no Wine grows, as in *Lapland*, *Norway*, &c.

To this I answer; First, That although no Wine grows in those Countries, yet some may be brought thither.

Secondly, But if none can be brought without being spoiled, and its form changed, then it is better to substitute the ordinary drink of the Country in stead of Wine.

Thirdly, But if this common drink of the

the Country may not be substituted in stead of Wine, then they that cannot have Wine, do abstain from it, because they are forced thereunto; and it is neither impudence nor contempt, to abstain from a thing commanded by Jesus Christ, when it is not to be had: but to ordain that they that have wine in abundance shall abstain from the cup, is an insufferable boldness, and a most unchristian contempt of the Sacrament.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Against the Mass.

1. THe Mass, according to the *Romish* Doctors, is a Sacrifice of the Body and Bloud of Christ propitiatory for the sins of the living and dead; and so it is defined by the Council of *Trent*, *Session* 22. Against such a Mass we might alleadge all the Arguments already made use of against Transubstantiation, and the pretended presence of Christs body in the host; for our Adversaries confess that those reasons which destroy Transubstantiation, and the pretended presence of Christs body in the host, do also destroy the Mass. But in this Chapter we shall only use such Arguments as are directly against the Mass, and do utterly destroy it.

2. The first Argument is drawn from this, *viz.* that in the institution and first celebration of the Eucharist, Jesus Christ did not sacrifice nor offer his body and bloud to his Father, as appears by what is mentioned in the three Evangelists and the Apostle St. *Paul*, in which there is not the least foot-step to be seen of a sacrifice, or oblation of Christs body and bloud. This

Bellarmin

Bellarmin confeſſeth in *Book* 1. of the *Maſs*, *chap.* 27. in theſe words, *The oblation which is made after conſecration, belongs to the entireneſs of the Sacrament, but is not of its eſſence; which I prove, becauſe neither our Lord nor his Apoſtles, did make this oblation at the firſt, as we have demonſtrated out of* Gregory. The Jeſuite *Salmeron* in *Tom.* 13. of his Commentaries on the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, makes a Catalogue of unwritten Traditions, in which he puts the *Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchie, the worſhiping of Images, the Maſs, the manner of ſacrificing, and the tradition that Jeſus Chriſt did offer a ſacrifice in the Bread and Wine.* Card. *Baronius* in his Annals on the year 53. freely confeſſeth that the ſacrifice of the Euchariſt is an unwritten Tradition. A ſtrange thing that the Maſs, which is the foundation of the *Romiſh* Church (for the Doctors require nothing of the people, but that they ſhould go to Maſs) cannot be found to have been inſtituted or commanded by Jeſus Chriſt. And the truth is, if Jeſus Chriſt in the celebration of the Euchariſt had offered unto God his Father a ſacrifice of his Body and Bloud, propitiatory for the ſins of the living and dead, then there had been no need that he ſhould have been ſacrificed again on the Croſs, becauſe, having already expiated our ſins in the ſacrifice of the Euchariſt, there was no need he ſhould expiate them

them again on the Cross. To this I add, that St. *Paul*, *Ephes.* 4. 11. mentions the Offices which Jesus Christ left his Church when he ascended into Heaven, in these words, *He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors, and Teachers*, but makes no mention at all of the Sacrificers of Christs body and bloud, nor in 1 *Tim.* nor in the Epistle to *Titus*, when he describes the duty of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, without making the least mention of this sacrificing of Christs body and bloud.

3. The second Argument is drawn from the definition of a Sacrifice, as it is given us by our Adversaries, Card. *Bellarmin* in *Book* 1. of the *Mass*, *chap.* 2. defines it thus: *Sacrifice is an external oblation made to God alone, whereby in acknowledgment of humane infirmity, and the divine Majesty, the lawful Minister consecrates by a mystical ceremony, and destroys something that is sensible and permanent.* From these last words, *viz.* that the lawful Minister destroys something that is sensible, I form two Arguments which destroy the sacrifice of the Mass.

The first is this, In every sacrifice the thing sacrificed must fall under our senses; for our Adversaries say it is a sensible thing: But the body and bloud of Christ, which are pretended to be sacrificed in the Mass, under the accidents

cidents of the bread and wine, do not fall under our senses, as we find by experience: Therefore the body and bloud of Christ, which are pretended to be under the accidents of the bread and wine, are not the thing sacrificed.

The second Argument is this: In every true sacrifice the thing sacrificed must be utterly destroyed; that is, it must be so changed, that it must cease to be what it was before, as *Bellarmin* saith in expres terms in the place above cited: But in the pretended Sacrifice of the Mass Christs body and bloud are not destroyed, for *Jesus Christ dieth no more, Rom. 6.* Therefore in the pretended Sacrifice of the Mass, the body and bloud of Christ are not the thing sacrificed.

4. To these two Arguments *Bellarmin* in *Book* 1. of the *Mass*, *ch.* 27. and other *Romish* Doctors answer, that Christs body simply is not the thing sacrificed in the Mass, but it is Christs body, as it is under the species of the bread; and that it is in reference to the species of the bread, that Christs body is sensible and visible.

Secondly, They answer that in the sacrifice of the Mass Christs body is destroyed in respect of its sacramental being, but not in respect of its natural being; for when it is eaten in the sacrament it ceaseth to be under the species of the bread.

5. To

5 To these answers I reply, First, That Christ body is not visible by the species of the bread, because, as our Adversaries say, that hides it from us, and hinders us from seeing it. And although a substance may be said to be visible, and cognizable by its accidents, yet it is never so by the accidents of another substance; and consequently Jesus Christ may be said to be visible by his own accidents, but not by the accidents of the bread, which are just alike both in the consecrated and unconsecrated hosts; and 'tis a ridiculous shift to say that Christs body is visible under the species of the bread, because that species is visible; for as we cannot see Wine that is in a Hogshead, because we see the Hogshead; and we cannot see Money that is in a Purse closed, because we see the Purse; so neither can we see the body under the species of the bread, because we see the species; for as our Adversaries say, that species hinders us from seeing it.

6. Secondly, I say, That by the sacramental being is understood, only an accidental being of Jesus Christ (for example his presence in the Sacrament) or else besides that, is understood his substantial being too. If his substantial being be also understood (seeing the substantial being of a thing is nothing else but its substance and nature) then it will follow that if Jesus Christ

Chriſt be deſtroyed in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt in reſpect of his ſubſtantial being, he muſt alſo be deſtroyed in reſpect of his natural being, which is contrary to what the Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom.6.* that *Jeſus Chriſt dieth no more.* If an accidental being of Jeſus Chriſt be only underſtood (for example, his preſence in the Sacrament) then theſe abſurdities will follow, *viz.*

Firſt, That the ſacrifice of the Maſs will be the ſacrifice of an accident only, and not of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe the preſence of Jeſus Chriſt is not Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, but an accident of him.

Secondly, It will follow that the ſacrifice of the Maſs, and that of the Croſs will not be the ſame ſacrifice in reference to the thing ſacrificed, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt, and his preſence are not the ſame thing; Jeſus Chriſt being a ſubſtance, and his preſence an accident, which is contrary to the deciſion of the Council of *Trent*, which hath determined that the ſacrifice of the Maſs, and that of the Croſs, are the ſame in reference to the thing ſacrificed.

Thirdly, It will follow that the thing which is deſtroyed in the Sacrament, is not the ſame with that, which was produced there, becauſe there is only an accident deſtroyed, whereas a ſubſtance was produced by Tranſubſtantiation,

tion, which is a substantial conversion, as hath been sufficiently proved.

Fourthly, It will follow that the sacrifice of the Mass will be offered in the Priests stomach only, because this presence is not destroyed till the Priest hath eaten the host; and consequently, the sacrifice of the Mass will be offered after the Mass, for this presence is only destroyed by the destruction of the accidents; and commonly these accidents are not destroyed till after Mass is said.

Fifthly, It will follow that the justice of God will cease to be the same; for whereas heretofore it could not be satisfied but by the death of Christ, and by the destruction of his natural being; now God is appeased, our sins expiated, and Gods justice satisfied by the destruction of his sacramental being only; for they will have it, that the sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory for the sins of the living and the dead.

7. The third Argument is drawn from these words of the Apostle, *Heb. 9. Almost all things are by the Law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission: It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the Heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices then these.* From which words I form this Argument.

There is no propitiation, or remiſſion of ſins without ſheding of bloud, as the Apoſtle ſaith: But in the Maſs there is no ſheding of bloud (for it is called an Unbloudy ſacrifice:) Therefore in the Maſs there is no propitiation or remiſſion of ſins; and conſequently no propitiatory ſacrifice for ſin. This Argument may be thus confirmed: Under the Old Teſtament there was no propitiation, or purification, without ſheding of bloud, and the types of heavenly things were ſo purified, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *Heb.* 9. Therefore under the New Teſtament alſo there can be no propitiation or purification without ſheding of bloud, and heavenly things, being repreſented by the legal types, muſt be purified by a more excellent ſacrifice, *viz.* by the ſheding of Chriſts bloud. And although the Apoſtle uſeth the word *Sacrifices* in the plural number, yet we muſt underſtand the only ſacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs; becauſe when one thing is oppoſed to many, it is often expreſſed in the plural number; as when Baptiſm, which is but one, is called Baptiſms, *Heb.* 6. 2. But the only ſacrifice of the Croſs of Chriſt in the Text above cited, *Heb.* 9. 23. is oppoſed to the old Sacrifices, which were types and figures of the ſacrifice of the Croſs.

8. The fourth Argument is drawn from the words

words of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 10. 16. *This is the Covenant which I will make with them after thoſe days ſaith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them, and their ſins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remiſſion of theſe is, there is no more offering for ſin.* Whence I form this Argument: Where there is remiſſion of ſins there is no need of an oblation, or a propitiatory ſacrifice for ſin, as the Apoſtle ſaith. But in the Chriſtian Church, by vertue of the New Teſtament, or New Covenant, confirmed by the bloud of Chriſt, there is remiſſion of ſins, *Heb.* 10. 16, 17. Therefore in the Chriſtian Church now adays, there is no need of an oblation, or propitiatory ſacrifice, and conſequently no need of the ſacrifice of the Maſs.

9. The fifth Argument is drawn from the words of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9. *Jeſus Chriſt offereth not himſelf often, as the High Prieſt entereth into the holy place every year with the bloud of others; for then muſt he often have ſuffered from the foundation of the World, but now once in the end of the World, hath he appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf. And as it is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment, ſo Chriſt was once offered to bear the ſins of many, and unto them that look for him ſhall he appear the ſecond time without ſin unto ſalvation.*

This is confirmed by the words of the ſame Apoſtle, *Heb.* 10. *The Law having a ſhadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with thoſe ſacrifices which they offered year by year, continually make the comers thereunto perfect, for then would they not have ceaſed to be offered, becauſe the worſhipers once purged, ſhould have had no more conſcience of ſins. But in thoſe a remembrance is made again of ſins every year; for it is not poſſible that the bloud of bulls and of goats ſhould take away ſins, &c. And every High Prieſt ſtandeth dayly miniſtring and offering often times the ſame ſacrifices which can never take away ſins; but this man after he had offered one ſacrifice for ſins, for ever ſate down on the right hand of God. For by one offering he hath for ever perfected them that are ſanctified:* which is conformable to what he had ſaid a little before, that *we are ſanctified by the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all.* From all which I form theſe Arguments.

1o. Firſt the old ſacrifices were reiterated, for the Apoſtle ſaith that *the High Prieſt entereth into the holy place every year with the bloud of others:* but the ſacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt muſt not be reiterated, for the ſame Apoſtle ſaith that *Jeſus Chriſt offereth not himſelf often*; and that *he hath once appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf:* Therefore the ſacrifice of

the

the Maſs is not the ſacrifice of the Croſs reiterated, or the reiteration of the ſacrifice of the Croſs, as our Adverſaries would have it.

11. Secondly, The Apoſtle adding, *elſe he ſhould often have ſuffered from the foundation of the World*, Makes it apparent that Chriſt cannot be offered without ſuffering: For, as he that ſhould ſay, this is not fire elſe it would be hot, doth neceſſarily preſuppoſe that fire is hot; and as he that ſhould ſay he is no man elſe he would be rational, doth neceſſarily preſuppoſe that man is rational; ſo when the Apoſtle ſaith, that *Jeſus Chriſt offereth not himſelf often, otherwiſe he ſhould often have ſuffered*, doth neceſſarily preſuppoſe that Jeſus Chriſt cannot offer himſelf without ſuffering. But Jeſus Chriſt doth not ſuffer every day in the Maſs: Therefore he is not offered every day in the Maſs by the miniſtry of Prieſts.

12. Thirdly, Theſe words, *from the foundation of the World*, are of great weight, for it is as much as if the Apoſtle had ſaid, if the only ſacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs be not ſufficient to take away ſins which ſhall be committed hereafter, it follows that it was not ſufficient to take away ſins which have been committed heretofore from the creation of the World, for it is very unſuitable that the ſacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs ſhould have more vertue

before it was offered then since: But the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, had the vertue to take away sins before it was, *otherwise* (saith the Apostle) *he should often have suffered from the foundation of the World*: Therefore it hath also vertue to take away sins committed since it was, and consequently there is no need that it should be reiterated in the Mass.

13. Fourthly, The Apostles comparison is considerable, the sense whereof is this: As men suffer death but once, and after death appear no more till the day of the resurrection, and day of judgment; so Christ hath offered himself to his Father once for all on the Cross to take away sins, and will be no more on earth until he comes to judge the quick and the dead. This utterly destroys the Mass, in which Jesus Christ is said to be offered and sacrificed continually by the ministry of Priests.

14. Fifthly, Sacrifices that take away sins, and sanctifie those that come thereunto, ought not to be reiterated; for the only reason which the Apostle alledgeth, why the old sacrifices of the Law were reiterated, is because they could not take away sins, nor sanctifie the comers thereunto as appears by the Text above cited. But the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross, takes away sins and sanctifies those that come thereunto: Therefore the sacrifice of Jesus Christ

Christ on the Cross, ought not to be reiterated, and consequently is not reiterated in the Mass.

15. If Jesus Christ did offer himself a sacrifice on the Cross that he might sanctifie us for ever, and purchase eternal redemption for us, then it is evident that the fruit and efficacy of this sacrifice endures for ever, and that we must have recourse to no other sacrifice but to that of the Cross: But Jesus Christ did offer himself a sacrifice on the Cross, that he might sanctifie us for ever, and purchase eternal redemption for us, as appears by the Texts aforesaid: Therefore the efficacy of the sacrifice of the Cross endures for ever, and we must have recourse to no other sacrifice but to that of the Cross. In a word, either we must confess that the sacrifice of the Cross hath no vertue to take away sins, and to sanctifie us for ever, (which is contrary to what the Apostle saith) or else if it hath this vertue and sufficiency, then Jesus Christ hath offered one only sacrifice once for all, and consequently is not offered dayly in the Mass by the Ministry of Priests.

16. Lastly, The Apostle almost throughout the whole Epistle to the *Hebrews*, saith, that Jesus Christ was constituted and consecrated by his Father, High Priest for ever; and particularly *chap.* 7. he saith, That *many were made Priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason*

of death; but Jesus Christ because he continueth for-ever, hath an unchangeable Priesthood; and that he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them; and consequently he hath no need of Vicars, or companions in his Priesthood.

17. In answer to these Arguments the *Romish* Doctors are wont to say that the sacrifice of the Mass is the same with that of the Cross, in respect of the essence of the Sacrifice, the same thing being offered in both, *viz.* the body and bloud of Christ by the same Priest, *viz.* by Jesus Christ. But it differs in respect of the manner of offering; for on the Cross Jesus Christ offered himself bloudily, that is, when he died he shed his bloud for mankind; but in the Mass he offers himself unbloudily, that is, without shedding his bloud, and without dying: On the Cross, Jesus Christ was destroyed in respect of his natural being, but in the Mass he is destroyed in respect of his sacramental being. They add, that all the Arguments drawn from the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, respect only that bloudy oblation which was once offered on the Cross; but besides this bloudy sacrifice there is another that is unbloudy, which is daily offered in the Mass. Lastly, They say, that the sacrifice of the Cross is primitive and original, but this of the Mass representative, com-

commemorative, and applicative of that of the Cross as the Council hath it in its 22. *Session.*

18. To these distinctions I reply, That the sacrifice of the Mass doth not differ from that of the Cross in respect of the manner only, (which is but an accidental difference) but it differs in respect of essence too.

First, Because the natural death of Jesus Christ is of the essence of the sacrifice of the Cross: But the sacrifice of the Mass doth not comprehend the natural death of Jesus Christ, for *Jesus Christ dieth no more*, *Rom. 6.* Therefore the sacrifice of the Mass doth not comprehend that which is of the essence of the sacrifice of the Cross, and consequently differs from it essentially, and not in respect of the manner only.

Secondly, Because the representation of a thing differs essentially from the thing represented: For example, The Kings Picture differs essentially from the King. Also the memorial of a thing differs essentially from the thing whereof it is a memorial: For example, The celebration of the Passover, which was a memorial of the Angels favourable passing over the houses of the *Israelites*, differs essentially from that passing over. And lastly, the application of a thing differs essentially from it: For example, The application of a Plaister differs essentially from

from the Plaiſter. But according to the determination of the Council of *Trent*, in *Seſſion* 22. the ſacrifice of the Maſs is repreſentative, commemorative, and applicative of that of the Croſs: Therefore the ſacrifice of the Maſs differs eſſentially from that of the Croſs.

Thirdly, Becauſe the ſacrifice of the Croſs is of an infinite value, and conſequently ought not to be reiterated; for its value being infinite, it is ſufficient to take away all ſins paſt, preſent, and to come, as *Bellarmin* ſaith *Book* 1. of the *Maſs*, *chap.* 4. But the ſacrifice of the Maſs is of a finite price and value, according to the ſame *Bellarmin* and other *Romiſh* Doctors; at which we may juſtly wonder, ſeeing, as our Adverſaries ſay, it differs not from the ſacrifice of the Croſs, either in reſpect of the thing ſacrificed, or in reſpect of the chief Prieſt, and yet from theſe the ſacrifice hath all its price and value.

19. Secondly, I ſay that an unbloudy propitiatory ſacrifice is a feigned, and an imaginary thing, and that the Arguments drawn from the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, do wholy deſtroy it.

Firſt, Becauſe it is ſaid, *Heb.* 9. *that without ſhedding of blond there is no remiſſion of ſins*: Therefore in the unbloudy ſacrifice of the Maſs, there can be no remiſſion of ſins, and con-

consequently it cannot be a propitiatory sacrifice for sin.

Secondly, Because Jesus Christ cannot be offered without suffering; for the Apostle saith, *Heb.6. Jesus Christ offereth not himself often, otherwise he should often have suffered:* But the sacrifice of Jesus Christ with suffering, is a bloudy sacrifice: Therefore there is no unbloudy sacrifice.

Thirdly, Because the bloudy sacrifice of the Cross, being of an infinite value, hath purchased an eternal redemption, *Heb.9.* and hath taken away all sins, past, present, and to come. Whence it follows that there is no other sacrifice either bloudy or unbloudy, that can purchase the pardon of our sins, the sacrifice of the Cross having sufficiently done it.

Fourthly, Because the justice of God requires that sins shall be expiated by the punishment that is due to them; and this is so true that the wrath of God could not be appeased but by the bloudy and ignominious death of the Cross: Therefore the justice of God must have changed its nature if sins can be expiated in the Mass without pain, or suffering.

20. Thirdly, To the distinction of Primitive sacrifice, which was offered on the Cross, and representative, commemorative, and applicative, which is daily offered in the Mass, I reply,

reply, First, That what the Council of *Trent* saith in *Session* 22. *viz.* that in the Eucharist there is a sacrifice representative, commemorative, and applicative of that of the Mass, may bear a good sense, *viz.* that there is in it a representation, commemoration, and application of the sacrifice of the Cross, *viz.* a representation, because the bread broken, represents the body broken; and the wine poured into the cup, represents the bloud of Christ shed for the remission of sins: a commemoration, because all that is done in it, is done in remembrance of Jesus Christ and his death according to his own command in these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, and according to what St. *Paul* saith, 1 *Cor.* 11. *As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lords death till he come*: and an application, because the merit of the sacrifice of the Cross is applied to us not only by the word, but also by the Sacraments, as we shall shew hereafter. But our Adversaries are not content with this, for they will have it that in the celebration of the Eucharist, there is offered a true and proper sacrifice propitiatory for the sins of the living and the dead, which hath been already refuted at large.

Secondly, I say that the application of the sacrifice of the Cross may be considered on

Gods

Gods part, or on mans part: on Gods part, when he offers Jesus Christ to us, with all his benefits, both in his Word and Sacraments: on mans part, when by a true and lively faith, working by love, we embrace Jesus Christ with all his benefits offered to us both in his Word and Sacraments. And this is it that Jesus Christ teacheth us, St. *John* 3. in these words, *As Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up,* (*viz.* on the Cross) *that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life: For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son,* (*viz.* to die) *that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life:* he doth not say, whosoever sacrificeth him in the Mass, but whosoever believeth, &c. And St. *Paul* shews it clearly in these words, *God hath set forth Jesus Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood*; he doth not say through the sacrifice of the Mass but through faith. And we really and truly apply the sacrifice of Christs Cross when we have recourse to him, as a man applies a Plaister when he hath recourse to it, and lays it on the wound: But the recourse or refuge of a penitent sinner to the sacrifice of the Cross for obtaining mercy from God, is nothing else but Faith. As for the distinction of the sacramental and natu-

natural being of Jeſus Chriſt, it hath been already refuted in the 6. Number.

21. I ſhall conclude this diſcourſe with the teſtimony of *Thomas Aquinas*, the moſt famous of all the *Romiſh* Doctors, and called by our Adverſaries, the Angelical Doctor. This *Thomas* in *Part.* 3. *Queſt.* 83. *Artic.* 1. having propoſed this Queſtion, *viz.* Whether Chriſt be ſacrificed in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, he concludes with theſe memorable words. *The celebration of this Sacrament is very fitly called a ſacrificing of Chriſt, as well becauſe it is the repreſentation of Chriſts Paſſion, as becauſe by this Sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of the Lords Paſſion.* And afterward he gives his anſwer, in theſe words: *I anſwer, We muſt ſay that the celebration of this Sacrament is called a ſacrificing of Chriſt, in two reſpects. Firſt, Becauſe (as* Auguſtine *to* Simplicius *ſaith) we are wont to give to Images the name of the things whereof they are Images, as when we ſee Pictures on a Wall, or in a Frame, we ſay this is* Cicero, *that is* Saluſt, *&c. But the celebration of this Sacrament (as hath been ſaid above) is a repreſentative Image of Chriſts Paſſion, which Paſſion is the true ſacrificing of Chriſt, and ſo the celebration of this Sacrament is the ſacrificing of Chriſt. Secondly, The celebration of this Sacrament is called the ſacrificing of Chriſt in regard of the effects of Chriſts*

Paſſion

Passion, because by this Sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of the Lords Passion. Let the *Romanists* keep to this decision of their Angelical Doctor, and we shall agree with them in this point; for I am confident that there is not one of the Reformed Religion but will subscribe this true doctrine of *Thomas Aquinas*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Containing Answers to the Objections of the Romish *Doctors.*

1. IN the two first Chapters we have answered the two principal Objections of the *Romish* Doctors, drawn from these words, *This is my body*, &c. and from these, *he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloud, hath eternal life*, &c. Now we must answer the rest.

Objection. 1.

2. The first Objection is this. When the establishing of Articles of Faith, the Institution of Sacraments, and the making Testaments and Covenants are in agitation, men speak plainly and properly, and not obscurely or figuratively: But in the celebration of the Eucharist Jesus Christ established an Article of Faith, instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and spake of a Testament and a Covenant; for it is said of the Cup that it is the New Testament and the New Covenant in the bloud of Christ; yea, he spake then to his Disciples, to whom he spake in plain and proper terms, and not in

in obſcure terms, or in figures or parables, as he did to the people.

Anſwer.

3. To this objection I anſwer, Firſt, That it is falſe that Articles of Faith are always expreſſed in proper terms in holy Scripture, as when it is ſaid in the Creed that *Jeſus Chriſt ſitteth on the right hand of God*, it is evident that this is a Figure and a Metaphor, for God being a Spirit, hath neither right hand nor left; and all interpreters expound this ſitting on Gods right hand, metaphorically, *viz.* for that Lordſhip both of Heaven and Earth, which he hath received from God his Father, as earthly Princes make their Lieutenants, whom they appoint to govern in their name, to ſit on the right ſide of them. Again, When it is ſaid, St. *Matth.* 16. *Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it; and I will give thee the Keys of the kingdom of Heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on earth ſhall be bound in heaven*, &c. It is manifeſt that theſe are Figures and Metaphors, as *Bellarmin* confeſſeth in *Book* 1. of the Biſhop of *Rome*, *chap.* 10. and yet it is chiefly by this paſſage that they endeavour to prove the Popes authority.

4. Secondly, I anſwer, That the holy Scripture commonly ſpeaks of Sacraments in figurative terms; thus Circumciſion is called Gods Covenant, *Gen.*17. in theſe words, *This is my Covenant, every male ſhall be circumciſed*, that is, this is the ſign of the Covenant, as appears by the following verſe, *Te ſhall circumciſe the fleſh of your foreskin, and it ſhall be a token of the Covenant between me and you.* So the Paſchal Lamb is called the Lords Paſsover, *Exod.* 12. becauſe the bloud of this Lamb ſprinkled on the dore-poſts, was given as a ſign of the Angels favourable paſſing over the houſes of the *Iſraelites*; as appears by *verſe* 13. of the ſame Chapter. So Baptiſm is called *the waſhing of Regeneration*, becauſe it is the Sacrament of it. In a word, The Euchariſtical cup is called the New Teſtament, becauſe it is the ſign, ſeal, and ſacrament of it.

5. Thirdly, I anſwer, That in holy Scripture, Teſtaments are not always expreſſed in proper terms without a Figure; for the Teſtament of *Jacob*, *Gen.*49. and that of *Moſes*, *Deut.* 33. are nothing elſe but a chain of Metaphors, and other Figures. And Civilians will have it, that in Teſtaments we ſhould not regard the proper ſignification of the words, but the intention of the Teſtator. To this I add that Jeſus Chriſt did not then make the New Teſtament

ment, and the New Covenant, but only inſtituted the Seal and Sacrament of them: For the Covenant was made with all mankind in the perſon of *Adam* after the Fall, when God promiſed him that the ſeed of the Woman ſhould break the Serpents head. This was afterward renewed with *Abraham*, when God promiſed him that in his ſeed all the Nations of the Earth ſhould be bleſſed, *viz.* in Chriſt, the bleſſed ſeed, who hath deſtroyed the Kingdom of Satan. After this it was confirmed by the bloud of Chriſt ſhed on the Croſs: Then it was publiſhed through all the World when the Apoſtles had received the Holy Ghoſt. And laſtly, Baptiſm and the Euchariſt are the Signs, Seals, and Sacraments of it.

6. Fourthly, I anſwer, That by theſe words, *To ſpeak clearly or plainly*, be underſtood, to ſpeak intelligibly, ſo that the Apoſtles might and ought to underſtand what he ſaid to them, then it is certain that Jeſus Chriſt did ſpeak clearly; for to ſpeak ſacramentally, and according to the ſtile uſed in all Sacraments, was to ſpeak clearly and not obſcurely: But if by theſe words, *to ſpeak clearly*, be underſtood to ſpeak without a figure, then it is falſe that he always ſpake clearly to his Diſciples, witneſs the calling of his Diſciples to whom he ſaid St. *Matth. 4. follow me, and I will make you fiſhers of men:*

And when he ſaith elſe where, *ye are the ſalt of the earth, the light of the world* &c. To this I add, The Apoſtles did ask Jeſus Chriſt the meaning of Parables, and other things which they did not underſtand; and therefore certainly they had much more reaſon to ask the meaning of ſo many ſtrange things as follow from the Maſs, from Tranſubſtantiation, and from the pretended preſence of Chriſts body in the Hoſt, *viz.* how a humane body can be in a point, and in divers places at once? how the head of Jeſus Chriſt and his whole body could be in his mouth? how accidents can be without a ſubject? *&c.*

7. Laſtly, Seeing Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, *drink ye all of this cup*, all Prieſts, whether Jeſuites, Monks, or other *Romiſh* Doctors, would of neceſſity be conſtrained, really, properly, and without a figure, to drink of the cup, whether melted or not, and really to ſwallow it, until they ſhould confeſs that there are figures in the words of Jeſus Chriſt in the celebration of the Euchariſt.

Objection 2.

8. The ſecond Objection is this: The Sacrament of the Euchariſt is more excellent then that of the Paſſover, becauſe the Sacrament of the

the Paſſover is a type of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and the thing typified is always more excellent then the type: But if the Sacrament of the Euchariſt did not really contain the body and bloud of Chriſt, but was only the ſign of it, then it would follow that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt would not be more excellent then that of the Paſſover; nay, the Sacrament of the Paſſover would be more excellent then that of the Euchariſt; becauſe a Lamb and its bloud is more excellent then Bread and Wine; and the death of a Lamb, and the ſhedding of its bloud, doth much better repreſent the death of Chriſt, and the ſhedding of his bloud on the Croſs, then Bread broken, and Wine poured into a cup can do.

Anſwer.

9. To this I anſwer, Firſt, That the thing typified by the Paſchal Lamb, is Jeſus Chriſt, and not the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; as St. *Paul* ſhews clearly, 1 *Cor.* 5. when he calls Jeſus Chriſt our Paſſover, in theſe words, *Chriſt our Paſſover was crucified for us.* The truth is, a whole Lamb without ſpot or blemiſh killed and burnt toward the evening, and its bloud ſhed, doth very well repreſent Jeſus Chriſt perfect, without ſin, put to death, and his bloud

ſhed toward the end of the World, and in the fulneſs of time; but ſuch a Lamb repreſents nothing of that which is ſeen in the Euchariſt. Beſides the Types and Sacraments of the Old Teſtament were inſtituted that the Faithful of thoſe Times might come to the knowledge of the things typified and ſignified, for the ſalvation of their ſouls: But the Faithful under the Old Teſtament never came to the knowledge of the Euchariſt by the Paſchal Lamb; and though they had come to the knowledge of it, yet they had had no benefit thereby. In a word, ſeeing the Paſſover and the Euchariſt are types, images, and ſigns, of Jeſus Chriſt, 'tis very impertinent to ſay, that the Paſſover is the type of the Euchariſt, becauſe a type is not properly the type of another type, but only of the thing typified; as the image of *Cæſar* is not the image of another image of *Cæſar*, but only of *Cæſar* himſelf.

10. Secondly, I anſwer, that the excellence of one Sacrament above another, muſt be drawn from its form and efficacie, and not from its matter, becauſe it is form that chiefly gives being to things compoſed of matter and form. But the form of Sacraments depends on the words of Inſtitution, becauſe being ſigns of divine Inſtitution, their form can only depend upon the will of God, who chooſeth certain things

things to ſignifie other things; and this will of God cannot be known but by revelation, which is the Word; ſo that it is properly ſaid that the Word joined with the Element makes the Sacrament: Therefore, although the Sacrament of the Paſſover be more excellent then the Euchariſt in reſpect of its matter, becauſe the Paſchal Lamb and its bloud, are more excellent then the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt; and that the Lamb and its bloud have a greater analogie with Jeſus Chriſt and his bloud ſhed on the Croſs, then the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt have; yet the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is much more excellent then that of the Paſſover in reſpect of its form, which depends on the words of Inſtitution, becauſe that at the inſtitution of the Sacrament of the Paſſover God ſpake not one word of the principal end for which he did inſtitute it, *viz.* to be the type of Jeſus Chriſt and his death. But at the inſtitution of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt Chriſt declared in expreſs terms, that he did inſtitute the eating of the bread broken, and the drinking of the wine, poured into the cup, to be commemorative ſigns of himſelf, and his death. The Sacrament of the Euchariſt is yet more excellent then that of the Paſſover, in reſpect of its efficacy, which depends on two things, *viz.* on the form, which being more

manifeſt in the Euchariſt, doth alſo operate with more efficacy, and alſo becauſe it repreſents a thing paſt, *viz.* the death of Chriſt. But the knowledge of things paſt is more clear and perfect then the knowledge of things to come; and we are more toucht with the memory of things paſt, when ſome ſymbole brings them to our thoughts, then when we conſider things to come, through clouds and ſhadows. To this I add that the bread and wine of the Euchariſt have a greater analogie with Jeſus Chriſt then the Paſchal Lamb had, in one reſpect, *viz.* in regard of the ſpiritual nouriſhment which we receive by Chriſts death; for as Baptiſm is the Sacrament of our ſpiritual birth, ſo the Euchariſt is the Sacrament of our ſpiritual nouriſhment. But this nouriſhment is much better repreſented by bread and wine, which are the ordinary nouriſhment of our bodies, then by a Lamb.

Laſtly, I anſwer, That it is far leſs inconvenient to give ſome prerogative to the Paſsover above the Euchariſt, (*viz.* to give it a more excellent matter and analogie) then to aſſert the corporal preſence of Chriſt in the Hoſt, by an unheard of Tranſubſtantiation, which deſtroys the nature of Sacraments, gives our Lord a monſtrous body, includes notorious abſurdities and contradictions, and gives the lye to Senſe,

Senſe, Reaſon, and holy Scripture; as hath been proved.

Objection 3.

11 The third Objection was propoſed at *Niſmes*, *Anno* 1657. by the Jeſuite S. *Rigant*, thus. God doth communicate, or can communicate to the creature in a finite degree that which he poſſeſſeth in an infinite degree. For example; God hath an infinite power whereby he can do all things at once; therefore he communicates, or can communicate to the creature a finite and limited power, whereby it may do divers things at once, as appears in a man, for he can ſee, hear, talk, and walk at the ſame time. God hath alſo an infinite wiſdom and knowledge, whereby he knows all things at once; therefore he communicates, or can communicate to the creature a finite knowledge, whereby it may know divers things at once. And even ſo God hath a virtual infinite extent, which is called immenſity, whereby he fills all things and all places at once: Therefore God communicates or can communicate to the creature, *viz.* to a body a finite extent, whereby it may fill divers ſpaces, and occupy ſeveral places at once. Whence it follows that Chriſts body may be in divers places at the ſame time, *viz.* in Heaven and in the Hoſt.

Anſwer.

Anſwer.

12. To this I anſwer, That as God cannot be in two places (for example, in heaven and upon earth) without being in all thoſe places that are between both, (for then he would be diſtant, and ſeparated from himſelf) ſo Chriſts body cannot be in two diſtant places, *viz.* at *Paris* and at *Rome*, in Heaven and upon Earth in the hoſt, without being in all thoſe places that are between both, for then it would be diſtant and ſeparated from it ſelf, which is impoſſible, as hath been ſufficiently proved. Therefore ſeeing Chriſts body is not in all places between *Paris* and *Rome*, and between Heaven and Earth, it follows that it is not in heaven and upon Earth in the hoſt, nor at *Paris* and *Rome* in conſecrated hoſts. So that to make a creature, for example the body of Chriſt, partaker of Gods extent or immenſity, it is ſufficient that as God by his infinite extent occupies all places, ſo Chriſts body ſhould by its finite extent occupy ſome place. But if to make it partake in a finite degree of this divine attribute of immenſity, it muſt be in divers places, yet it is ſufficient that it be in divers places ſucceſſively and not at once; or if to make it partake of this attribute it muſt be

in

in divers places at once, yet it is ſufficient that it occupies them by its ſeveral parts; for example, that the head be in one place, and the feet in another, &c. In a word, that it be without diſcontinuance or ſeparation, as God is every where without diſcontinuance. Thus the learned, Maſter *Bruguier* then anſwered and much better, but I cannot remember his full and compleat anſwer.

Objection 4.

13. The fourth Objection is this. If divers bodies may miraculouſly be in one and the ſame place, then it alſo follows that one body may miraculouſly be in divers places, there being no more difficulty or impoſſibility in the one then in the other. But divers bodies may miraculouſly be in one and the ſame place; for Jeſus Chriſt came into the room where his Diſciples were, the dores being ſhut, which he could not have done, if his body had not penetrated the dores. Beſides, It is ſaid that Jeſus Chriſt was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and conſequently *Mary* was a Virgin both before and after his birth, which could not have been if Jeſus Chriſt had not penetrated her belly and come forth without fraction or overture. Laſtly, Jeſus Chriſt penetrated the ſtone that

was

was laid on his ſepulchre when he roſe again; and it is ſaid that he penetrated the heavens when he aſcended.

Anſwer.

14 To this I anſwer, Firſt, That it is not ſaid that Jeſus Chriſt came in, the dores being ſhut; for theſe are the words, *The ſame day when it was evening, and the dores having been ſhut for fear of the Jews, Jeſus came*, &c. which words do indeed ſhew the time when Jeſus came in unto his Diſciples, but not the manner of his entry by penetration; but if the words be tranſlated, *the dores being ſhut*, and that they do import that the dores were not opened by any body, yet they do not exclude the opening of them in the twinckling of an eye by the divine power, ſith we have examples of this in holy Scripture; for *Acts* 5. we read that the Apoſtle went out of Priſon, though the dores had been faſt ſhut, but it is ſaid that *the Angel of God opened them.* And *Acts* 12. *The dore of the Priſon opened to S. Peter of its own accord*; that is, without being opened by any body. And ſo it is ſaid that Jeſus Chriſt entered, *the dores being ſhut, or having been ſhut*; which excludes the opening of them by any body, but not the opening of them by a divine

vine power in ſo ſhort a time that it was undiſcernable.

Secondly I anſwer, That the Virgin *Mary* was a true Virgin both before and after her delivery, if by being a Virgin be meant not to have had the company of a man; but it is certain that Jeſus Chriſt came out of the Virgins belly by opening her womb; for it is ſaid, St. *Luke* 2. that *Joſeph and Mary carried Jeſus Chriſt to Jeruſalem to preſent him to the Lord; as it is written in the Law, every male that openeth the womb ſhall be holy unto the Lord.*

Thirdly I anſwer, That Jeſus Chriſt did not penetrate the ſtone that was laid on his ſepulchre; for it is ſaid, St. *Matth.* 28. That *the Angel of God rolled it back from the dore of the ſepulchre.*

Fourthly I anſwer, That when it is ſaid, *Heb.* 4. that Jeſus Chriſt penetrated the heavens, we muſt underſtand it improperly, in the ſame manner as it is commonly ſaid that an Arrow penetrates the Air; that is, the Air gives way to the Arrow that paſſeth through the Air; and ſo Jeſus Chriſt penetrated the Heavens, becauſe the Heavens gave way to his body, and not that the Heavens and his Body were in one and the ſame place.

15. All the *Romiſh* Doctors agree with us, that modal accidents (which are nothing elſe but

but the manners of the being of ſubſtances, as action, paſſion, relation, figure, &c.) cannot be without a ſubject, no not by the power of God himſelf. But all the Objections by which they endeavour to prove that the accidents of the bread and wine may exiſt without a ſubject, (that is, without their ſubſtance) do prove the ſame thing of modal accidents too. So that I ſhall not ſtay now to repeat thoſe Objections with their Anſwers, which are ſet down at large in my diſpute about the Euchariſt.

Objection 5.

16. The fifth Objection is drawn from *Mal.* 1. in theſe words, *From the riſing of the Sun unto the going down of the ſame my name ſhall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place ſhall they offer incenſe to my name, and a new and pure offering:* where by this new and pure offering nothing can be underſtood but the ſacrifice of the Maſs; becauſe by this offering we cannot underſtand Prayers, Alms, Contrition of heart, and other good works, which are ſometimes in Scripture called Oblations and Sacrifices, for the Prophet *Malachi* promiſeth a new offering. But Prayers, Alms, and other good works were common amongſt the Jews; and beſides, they of the Reformed Church do believe that all the actions

actions of the Faithful are poluted, and the Prophet ſpeaks of a pure and clean offering. Again, By this offering which *Malachi* ſpeaks of, cannot be underſtood Lambs, Bulls, and ſuch like Animals, which were wont to be ſacrificed in *Solomons* Temple; becauſe the Prophet promiſeth that it ſhall be offered in every place, even amongſt the Heathen. Laſtly, By this offering cannot be underſtood the bloudy ſacrifice which Jeſus Chriſt offered on the Croſs, becauſe that bloudy ſacrifice was offered but once upon Mount *Calvary* in *Judea*, and the Prophet ſpeaks of an oblation that ſhall be offered in every place: Therefore by this offering muſt be underſtood the ſacrifice of the body and bloud of Chriſt, under the ſpecies of the bread and wine, which is nothing elſe but the Maſs.

Anſwer.

17. To this I anſwer, Firſt, That by the offering whereof *Malachy* ſpeaks, muſt be underſtood that ſpiritual Worſhip and Service which Believers ſhould perform unto God under the New Teſtament, which is compriſed in that ſacrifice which they offer to God, both of their perſons and religious actions; and this is the reaſon why St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 12. ſpeaks thus. *I beſeech you therefore, Brethren, by the mercies of God*

God that ye preſent your bodies a living ſacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reaſonable ſervice. And *chap.* 15. ſpeaking of the grace that was given him of God, he ſaith, *it is given him that he ſhould be the Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt to the Gentiles, miniſtring the Goſpel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being ſanctified by the Holy Ghoſt.* Whence it appears that by this oblation whereof *Malachy* ſpeaks, we muſt not underſtand the offering of Chriſts body and bloud under the accidents of bread and wine, but the offering up of the perſons and religious actions of thoſe that ſhould be brought unto God by the preaching of the Goſpel, and particularly the Gentiles.

18. Secondly I anſwer, That in the whole paſſage of *Malachy* above cited, the words *new offering* are not to be found, but only *clean offering.* And though a new offering had been there ſpoken of, yet I ſay that things may be ſaid to be new, when being ſpoiled and corrupted, they are reſtored and made ſound again. But the ſervice of God which had been corrupted under the Law, was re-eſtabliſhed by Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles under the Goſpel, ſo that all things were made new; a new Time, *viz.* the time of the preaching of the Goſpel; a new People, *viz.* the Chriſtian People; a new place, *viz.* all parts of the World, and not at

Jeruſa-

Jeruſalem only; a new Prayer, *viz.* the Lords Prayer; new Sacraments, *viz.* Baptiſm and the Lords Supper; and new Preaching, *viz.* the preaching of ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt.

19. Thirdly I anſwer that the oblation which is offered unto God under the Goſpel, is pure and clean; the ſervice which is performed to him, according to his Word, is pure; the preaching of the Goſpel is pure. In a word, the Chriſtian Religion is pure, though there be many failings in thoſe that profeſs it. And although the Faithful that preſent their bodies a living ſacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, be compaſſed about with many infirmities, and that their religious actions be accompanied with divers failings, yet their perſons and works may be ſaid to be pure and clean in Jeſus Chriſt, in whoſe name they are preſented to God; ſo that although they cannot of themſelves pleaſe or ſatisfie God; yet as they are members of Chriſt, they are reputed holy before God: for it is theſe St. *Peter* ſpeaks of in *Epiſt.* 1. *chap.* 2. *who as living ſtones, are built up a ſpiritual houſe, a holy Prieſthood, to offer up ſpiritual ſacrifices, acceptable to God by Jeſus Chriſt.* And ſo our ſacrifices are a pure and clean offering, but it is through Jeſus Chriſt, who covers them with his purity and holineſs, ſo that the defects of them are not imputed to

us. To this I add, That beſides the perfect purity which we have by the imputation of Chriſts righteouſneſs, we have alſo a purity begun by the Holy Ghoſt; of which St. *Paul* ſpeaks *Rom.* 15. in theſe words, that *the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being ſanctified by the Holy Ghoſt*: for that which God hath decreed, Jeſus Chriſt hath purchaſed, and the Holy Ghoſt hath begun, is reputed by God perfect and compleat. And St. *Paul* ſhews clearly the truth of what hath been ſaid, 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. in theſe words, *I will that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.* And *Epheſ.* 5. *Jeſus Chriſt loved the Church, and gave himſelf for it, that he might ſanctifie and cleanſe it with the waſhing of water by the Word, that he might preſent it to himſelf, a glorious Church, not having ſpot or wrinkle, or any ſuch thing, but that it ſhould be holy and without blemiſh.*

Objection 6.

20. The ſixth Objection is drawn from *Gen.* 14. in theſe words: *And Melchiſedec King of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine (for he was a Prieſt bleſſed him.* And from *Pſal.* 110. and from *Heb.* 7. where it is ſaid, *Thou art a Prieſt for ever, after the order of Melchiſedec.* From which words our Adverſaries argue thus.

First,

Firſt, They ſay that Jeſus Chriſt is a Prieſt, not after the order of *Aaron*, but after the order of *Melchiſedec*; the difference between *Aaron* and *Melchiſedec* conſiſting in this, *viz.* that *Aaron* and the other Levitical Prieſts offered bloudy Sacrifices, killing and ſhedding the bloud of Beaſts, which they ſacrificed to God, as a ſign and figure of the bloudy ſacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt on the Croſs. But *Melchiſedec* offered an unbloudy ſacrifice, for when he went to meet *Abraham* returning from the ſlaughter of the Kings, he offered to God Bread and Wine. And ſeeing this Bread and Wine offered to God by *Melchiſedec* were ſigns and types of Chriſts body and bloud, Jeſus Chriſt was obliged to offer an unbloudy ſacrifice, *viz.* his body and bloud under the ſpecies of bread and wine, which he did at the inſtitution and celebration of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, that ſo the reality of the thing typified might anſwer thoſe ſhadows and types. Secondly, That although *Melchiſedec* had brought all this bread and wine for the refreſhment of *Abraham* and his Army that returned from the ſlaughter of the Kings, yet he firſt offered it to God, and then gave it to them, that ſo they might partake of the ſacrifice of bread and wine. And the reaſon of this is, becauſe the Scripture ſaith that *Abraham* returned from the battel with great ſpoils, amongſt

which there was meat and drink enough for the refreſhment of himſelf and his people: alſo it ſaith expreſly that *Abrahams* people had taken ſuch refreſhment as was neceſſary before *Melchiſedec* met them; and conſequently they had no need of the bread and wine which he brought, except it had been to partake of the ſacrifice of the bread and wine which he offered. Thirdly, They ſay this is ſtrongly proved by the following words, *for he was Prieſt of the moſt high God*, which ſhew the reaſon why *Melchiſedec* brought bread and wine, *viz.* to make an oblation or offering of it to God; for if he had brought this bread and wine for the refreſhment of *Abraham* and his people, the Scripture would have ſaid that he had brought this bread and wine, becauſe that *Abraham* and his Army being faint and tired, had need of meat and drink; but it ſpeaks nothing of this: on the contrary it ſaith that he brought bread and wine, *for he was Prieſt.* Fourthly, They ſay that *Jeſus Chriſt is a Prieſt for ever, after the order of Melchiſedec*; and ſeeing there can be no Prieſt without a ſacrifice, there can be no eternal Prieſt without an eternal or perpetual ſacrifice. But the ſacrifice of the Croſs was offered but once, and cannot be reiterated, *for Jeſus Chriſt dieth no more*, *Rom.* 6. Therefore there muſt be another perpetual ſacrifice in the Church, which Jeſus Chriſt

Christ offereth by the hands of Priests, which can be nothing else but the sacrifice of the Mass, *viz.* the sacrifice of Christs body and bloud under the species of the bread and wine, typified by the sacrifice of the bread and wine of *Melchisedec.*

Answer.

21. To this I answer; First, That the Hebrew word doth not signifie *bringing* but *brought*, drew out, caused to be brought, *&c.* but our Adversaries falsifie the Text thus, to make way for another fallification, *viz.* to put these words in a Parenthesis (*for he was Priest*) in stead of putting them without a Parenthesis, *and he was Priest*; so that we may say that in these few words they have made three fallifications; first, when they translate it *proferens*, that is bringing, in stead of translating it *protulit*, that is brought, or drew out: secondly, when they translate it *erat enim sacerdos*, that is, *for he was Priest*, in stead of translating it, *and he was Priest*: thirdly, when they translate it *benedixit ei*, that is, *blessed him*, instead of translating it *& benedixit ei*, that is, *and he blessed him.* And so of three different propositions, *viz. Melchisedech* also brought bread and wine, and he was Priest, and he blessed him; they

which there was meat and drink enough for the refreſhment of himſelf and his people: alſo it ſaith expreſly that *Abrahams* people had taken ſuch refreſhment as was neceſſary before *Melchiſedec* met them; and conſequently they had no need of the bread and wine which he brought, except it had been to partake of the ſacrifice of the bread and wine which he offered. Thirdly, They ſay this is ſtrongly proved by the following words, *for he was Prieſt of the moſt high God*, which ſhew the reaſon why *Melchiſedec* brought bread and wine, *viz.* to make an oblation or offering of it to God; for if he had brought this bread and wine for the refreſhment of *Abraham* and his people, the Scripture would have ſaid that he had brought this bread and wine, becauſe that *Abraham* and his Army being faint and tired, had need of meat and drink; but it ſpeaks nothing of this: on the contrary it ſaith that he brought bread and wine, *for he was Prieſt*. Fourthly, They ſay that *Jeſus Chriſt is a Prieſt for ever, after the order of Melchiſedec*; and ſeeing there can be no Prieſt without a ſacrifice, there can be no eternal Prieſt without an eternal or perpetual ſacrifice. But the ſacrifice of the Croſs was offered but once, and cannot be reiterated, *for Jeſus Chriſt dieth no more*, *Rom. 6.* Therefore there muſt be another perpetual ſacrifice in the Church, which Jeſus Chriſt

Christ offereth by the hands of Priests, which can be nothing else but the sacrifice of the Mass, *viz.* the sacrifice of Christs body and bloud under the species of the bread and wine, typified by the sacrifice of the bread and wine of *Melchisedec.*

Answer.

21. To this I answer; First, That the Hebrew word doth not signifie *bringing* but *brought*, drew out, caused to be brought, *&c.* but our Adversaries falsifie the Text thus, to make way for another fallification, *viz.* to put these words in a Parenthesis (*for he was Priest*) in stead of putting them without a Parenthesis, *and he was Priest*; so that we may say that in these few words they have made three fallifications; first, when they translate it *proferens*, that is bringing, in stead of translating it *protulit*, that is brought, or drew out: secondly, when they translate it *erat enim sacerdos*, that is, *for he was Priest*, in stead of translating it, *and he was Priest*: thirdly, when they translate it *benedixit ei*, that is, *blessed him*, instead of translating it *& benedixit ei*, that is, *and he blessed him.* And so of three different propositions, *viz. Melchisedech* also brought bread and wine, and he was Priest, and he blessed him; they

have made but one, with a Parentheſis, thus: *Melchiſedec* bringing bread and wine (for he was Prieſt) bleſſed him.

22. Secondly, I anſwer that the Hebrew word uſed by *Moſes*, ſignifies commonly brought, drew out, cauſed to be brought, cauſed to be drawn out, cauſed to come, *&c.* But we muſt not ſtray from the proper ſignification of words but upon very great neceſſity, which appears not in this Text. And although this Hebrew word ſhould ſignifie *brought to offer*, and that it ſhould be taken for *offered*, yet our Adverſaries would gain nothing by it; for it is not ſaid in the Text that he brought bread and wine to offer unto God; but we muſt rather expound it thus, *viz.* that he brought bread and wine to offer and preſent it to *Abraham*: And indeed the following words, *viz. and bleſſed him*, do clearly ſhew it, for the Pronoun Relative *him*, relates to *Abraham*, according to the expoſition of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 7. where he ſaith expreſly that *Melchiſedec met Abraham and bleſſed him.* And a little after he ſaith, that *Melchiſedec bleſſed him that had the promiſes; and that the leſs is bleſſed of the greater.* But if theſe words, *he brought bread and wine*, muſt be expounded thus, he offered bread and wine to God, then it muſt neceſſarily follow that *Melchiſedec* bleſſed God and not *Abraham*; for in theſe words, *viz.*

he

he offered bread and wine to God, and bleſſed him, the Pronoun *him* can relate to none but God.

23. Thirdly, I anſwer, That *Melchiſedec* brought bread and wine to *Abraham* to refreſh him and his people, and not to offer unto God. *Bellarmin* in *Book* 1. of the *Maſs*, *chap.* 6. confeſſeth that *Melchiſedec* brought bread and wine to *Abraham* to refreſh him and his people, who returned faint and tired from the ſlaughter of the Kings, which is true; but he adds that Jeſus Chriſt had offered it to God before, which is falſe, and cannot be proved. *Jerome* in his Epiſtle to *Euagrius*, writes that the Jews underſtood it that *Melchiſedec* meeting *Abraham* after his victory, brought bread and wine to refreſh him and his people. *Joſephus* writing this Hiſtory, ſaith, that *Melchiſedec* preſented bread and wine to *Abraham* to refreſh him and his Army. *Damaſcene*, *Book* 4. of the *Orthodox Faith*, ſaith that *Melchiſedec* treated *Abraham* with bread and wine.

24. Fourthly, The Reaſons of our Adverſaries, mentioned in the Objections to prove that *Melchiſedec* brought bread and wine to *Abraham* that he might partake of the ſacrifice which he had offered, are not conſiderable; *viz.* becauſe *Abraham* returned from the battle with great ſpoils; and ſo there was meat and drink enough

for him and his people; and that they had taken their repast before *Melchisedec* met them, &c. These Reasons, I say, are inconsiderable, because although *Abraham* had great spoils, yet he restored all to the King of *Sodom*; and though his people had eaten and drank of such as they found amongst the spoils, yet it is not said that *Abraham* did eat and drink; and though both he and his people had eaten and drank, yet it is not said how long it was since, and that they had no need of more provision; and though they had no need of more, yet *Melchisedec* not knowing that they had eaten and drank, did, that which prudent men are wont to do, *viz.* provide all that may be needful in case of necessity.

25. Fifthly, I answer, That the principal reason which our Adversaries bring to prove that *Melchisedec* offered unto God bread and wine, *viz.* because it is in the Hebrew Text, *for he was Priest*, is a manifest falsification; for it is in the Hebrew Text, *and he was Priest.* Also the old Latine Interpreter, and the Greek Septuagint translate it as we do, *viz. and he was Priest:* And it is very probable that this passage hath been corrupted in *Jeroms* Latine Translation, because in his Hebrew Questions, and in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, he translates it, *and he was Priest.* St. *Cyprian* in his Epistle to *Cæcilius*, and

and St. *August.* Book 4. of *Christian Doctrine*, *chap.* 21. and elsewhere, translate it, *and he was Priest.* So that although the Hebrew particle used by *Moses*, do sometimes signifie, *for*, yet seeing that both its proper and common signification is *and*; and that for one place where it signifies *for*, there are a thousand at least where it signifies *and*; and that there is nothing that obligeth us to translate it *for*; it is evident that the Argument of our Adversaries is of no force at all. Therefore it is more pertinent to refer these words, *and he was Priest*, to what follows, *viz. and blessed him*, then to what goes before, *viz. brought bread and wine.* For as *Melchisedec*, being a liberal King, brought bread and wine to *Abraham*, to refresh him and his people; so, as he was a Priest much more excellent then *Abraham*, he blessed him. And though it should be translated, *for he was Priest*, yet it would not follow that *Melchisedec* did sacrifice bread and wine unto God; for it might be said that *Moses* would shew the reason of the good will of *Melchisedec* toward *Abraham*; *viz.* it was very fit that he that was Priest of the most high God, should testifie his kindness to so eminent a servant of God as was *Abraham*, by presenting bread and wine to him, whereof he thought there was need.

26. Sixthly, I answer, That from what is said

said, *Psal.*110. and *Heb.*7. *viz.* that Jesus Christ is a Priest for ever, it will not follow that he must offer himself every day in the Mass, under the species of bread and wine, by the ministry of Priests; for the Apostle writing to the *Hebrews*, placeth the perpetuity of the Priesthood partly in this, *viz.* that there is no need he should be offered any more, seeing by one oblation he hath consecrated for ever those that are sanctified; and partly in this, *viz.* that being exalted far above the heavens, he intercedes continually for us; for the Priesthood consists in certain functions, and in the virtue and efficacy of them. And seeing there are two parts of Christs Priesthood, whereof one relates to the oblation of himself, which he offered on the Cross; and the other to his intercession; it is certain that the virtue and efficacy of the oblation is eternal, and that the intercession will continue unto the end of the World.

27. Seaventhly, I answer, That in all the holy Scripture where the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* is spoken of, three things only are mentioned of him, *viz.* that he was a Priest, that he was a Priest for ever, and that he was so with an oath, according to the application that is made of it to Jesus Christ in *Psal.* 110. and *Heb.*7. in these words, *The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a Priest for ever, after the*

the order of Melchisedec, but there is nothing at all spoken of the sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, nor is it said wherein it did consist: for as it was fit that all the offices which we find, were born by the greatest Kings, Priests, and Prophets under the Old Testament, should be collected in the person of the *Messiah*; which was done by proposing them as types and figures of Jesus Christ; and that the most illustrious type was *Melchisedec*; so it was more expedient not to speak of the nature of the sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, because it was not expedient then to speak of the nature of the sacrifice of the Messiah. And therefore although we know not the nature and quality of the sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, yet we know that he was a Priest: Even as we know that *Melchisedec* was a King, though we know not in what manner he executed his Kingly Office.

28. Lastly, I answer, That it is false that the difference between the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* and that of *Aaron* did consist in this, *viz.* that *Aaron* offered the bloudy sacrifices of Beasts, and *Melchisedec* offered an unbloudy sacrifice of bread and wine. It is also false that the likeness of the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* to that of Jesus Christ doth consist in this, *viz.* that as *Melchisedec* did sacrifice bread and wine, so Christ did sacrifice his body and bloud under the

the ſpecies of bread and wine: theſe are humane inventions, and are founded neither on Scripture nor Reaſon, for on the contrary, the Apoſtle writing to the *Hebrews*, placeth the difference between the Prieſthood of *Melchiſedec*, and that of *Aaron*, and its likeneſs to that of Chriſt in quite another thing. Firſt, He is called *Melchiſedec*, which being interpreted (as the Apoſtle ſaith *Heb.* 7.) is King of righteouſneſs; and then King of *Salem*, that is, King of Peace; and herein he very well repreſents our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who is truly King of righteouſneſs, not only becauſe he is righteous, and was always without ſin; but alſo becauſe by his ſatisfaction he hath purchaſed righteouſneſs for us, *being made unto us of God, righteouſneſs.* He is alſo truly King of peace, in that he hath reconciled men unto God, made their peace with the Angels and hath particularly recommended peace to them. As for *Aaron*, and other High Prieſts, they were no Kings, much leſs are the Prieſts of the *Romiſh* Church ſo, and conſequently cannot be after the order of *Melchiſedec*, and they that have written the lives of the Popes have ſufficiently declared what righteouſneſs and peace they have procured for the true and faithful ſervants of Jeſus Chriſt, as I ſhall ſhew at large elſewhere. Secondly, The Apoſtle *Heb.* 7. repreſents *Melchiſedec*

ſedec to us as a man come from heaven, *without father, without mother, without deſcent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life*: not that he was really ſuch a one, but becauſe *Moſes* hath wholy concealed from us his Father, Mother, Deſcent, Birth, and Death, that he might be the type of Chriſt, who was without Father, as he is Man; without Mother, as God; without Deſcent, both as God and as man; having neither beginning of days as God, nor end of life, as God or as Man. But the Fathers, Deſcent, Birth, and Death of *Aaron*, and other High Prieſts, are exactly deſcribed by *Moſes*. And there were never any Popes, Biſhops, or Prieſts, whoſe Parents, Birth, and Death, were not known, and conſequently they cannot be after the order of *Melchiſedec*. Thirdly, The Apoſtle adds, that *Melchiſedec being made like unto the Son of God, abideth a Prieſt for ever*; becauſe *Moſes* makes no mention of his death, nor of any one that ſucceeded him in his Prieſtly office; that ſo he might be the type of Jeſus Chriſt, who never left his Prieſtly office, but will exerciſe it until the end of the World, always interceding for thoſe that are his, by preſenting his ſacrifice to God the Father continually. As for *Aaron* and other Prieſts, they are dead, and have had ſucceſſors. And the Popes, Biſhops, and Prieſts, die daily, and have ſuc-

succeſſors; and conſequently are not after the order of *Melchiſedec*. Fourthly, The Apoſtle ſaith likewiſe, that *Melchiſedec* took tithes of *Abraham*, and adds that *Melchiſedec* bleſſed him that had the Promiſes, *viz.* *Abraham*, and that the leſs is bleſſed of the greater. Whence it appears that *Melchiſedec* having taken tithes of *Abraham*, and bleſſed him, and *Levi*, and all the Prieſts in his perſon, was more excellent then *Abraham*, *Levi*, and all the Prieſts. In which reſpect he was a type of Jeſus Chriſt, who was infinitely more excellent then *Abraham* and all his ſucceſſors, becauſe he in whom all the promiſes were fulfilled, muſt needs be incomparably more excellent then he that received them only. But I do not believe that the Prieſts of the *Romiſh* Church are ſo bold as to prefer themſelves before *Abraham*, the Father of the Faithful, in whoſe ſeed all the Nations of the Earth are bleſſed; and conſequently are not after the order of *Melchiſedec*. Fifthly, The Apoſtle never ſpake of the ſacrifice of *Melchiſedec*, ſo far was he from comparing it with the ſacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt, as being like it, or with that of *Aaron*, as being unlike it; ſo that all that our Adverſaries ſay of it, is nothing elſe but meer humane invention.

29. I conclude my anſwer with this Argument, Jeſus Chriſt hath offered no ſacrifice but after

after the order whereof he was eſtabliſhed a Prieſt. But he was eſtabliſhed a Prieſt after the order of *Melchiſedec* only, as the Apoſtle obſerves. Therefore he hath offered no ſacrifice but after the order of *Melchiſedec*: But (according to the *Romiſh* Doctors) there is no other ſacrifice after the order of *Melchiſedec*, but that of the Maſs: Therefore (according to the *Romiſh* Doctors) Jeſus Chriſt hath offered no other ſacrifice, but that of the Maſs. And ſeeing (according to them) the ſacrifice of the Maſs is an unbloudy ſacrifice, it follows that Jeſus Chriſt hath offered no other ſacrifice, but an unbloudy ſacrifice; and conſequently he hath not offered a bloudy ſacrifice on the Croſs, which is blaſphemy.

THE END.